State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 108, NO. 3 NEW YORK, MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1943 NUMBER 1468

Letter to Congress

DEAR CONGRESSMEN AND CONGRESSWOMEN: No deliberative body has ever faced a task more highly charged with consequences for the future than the one you face. You will be a crucial sector in the campaign of history: on what you do, on what you allow the President and his administrative assistants to do, may depend the future of our world for a century to come.

Except for a few outstanding leaders, the country knows very little about you. It is not that you are new, though some of you are. It is rather that the conditions of your task make you nameless and faceless, except perhaps in your own district and state. Your work is a crushing burden; you can easily sink into becoming errand-boys of your constituents; you are left without effective aid in fact-gathering, and the irresponsible outpourings of some of you have undermined the confidence of Americans in most congressional utterances. You are, on the whole, ordinary Americans. In that lies your great strength, if you can use it. In that also lies your great vulnerability, if you allow yourselves to be swayed by the easy slogans of those who are governed by their hate rather than by their sense of life's possibilities.

In his message to you last week the President set you an example of largeness of spirit. Despite provocations that would have made a lesser man irritable and pugnacious, he spoke to you with simplicity, buoyancy, serenity, and with an underlying note of affirmation. It was a great speech, for a great occasion, delivered by the leader of a great nation. Will you rise to the challenge of its greatness?

The military situation has been going well, in view of the Russian offensives, the warfare in the Pacific, the North African campaigns: should you any longer withhold the homage due, from liberals and tories alike, to a great Commander-in-Chief? Our allies have fought with skill and heroism: should you not put an end immediately to the talk about diminishing or terminating lease-lend? Our war weapons, with only minor bottlenecks, are being turned out of our factories on a scale hitherto thought impossible: should you not abate the labor-hatred which could spread among you like a virus and destroy you, as it once destroyed French parliamentary institutions? Our administrative effort is, by and large, an achievement to be proud of. To mobilize a nation like America in a brief year, despite its fierce individualism and its localisms, and to do it without the loss of liberty, is exactly the test of a living democracy: should you not be wary of those who would push administrative irritations into the foreground—those who would have you forget that they are but a small price to pay for victory?

Your leaders want the Seventy-eighth Congress to be known as the Victory Congress. It will merit that name only if it understands that victory will not be enough if it is gained only over the enemies in the field. It must also be a victory over poverty and inadequate jobs, over insecurity, over world chaos—and in that war there is no armistice. Do you understand that? Numerous thoughtful people regard the approach of many of you to these problems with misgivings.

This is partly because, on the bare facts of the record, many of you who were most obstructive in the

CONTENTS

Letter to Congress 67
The Week 68
The Tragic Decade 70
Conditions at Camp Harmony 72
General Articles
The Smoldering Constitutional Crisis . . . . . Walton Hamilton 73
Los Angeles' Pachuco Gangs . Carey McWilliams 76
Techniques for a Post-War World . George Soule 77
Historic Landscape (verse) . . Eleanor Wells 80
Race Fear Sweeps the South . Thomas Sancton 81
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 84
Our Town . . . . . Manny Farber 85
The Bandwagon 85
Correspondence 86
Books in Review
The Imp of the Perverse . Malcolm Cowley 88
Marxian Economics Today . Ben B. Seligman 90
The Story of the Red Army . . John Scott 92
A Reader's List 93

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

old Congress have been reëlected, while some of the best of the old Congress are no longer with you, and some of the new voices sound as if they will be raised for the wrong causes. Nor is this only a matter of party. There are those who are elated because the party lines are more closely matched in the present Congress than in the last. Theoretically this might be cause for elation, but actually there are nominal Democrats among you who hate the President as heartily as if they were the most primitive Republicans. In terms of actual social beliefs, instead of party labels, the scales were balanced more evenly in the old Congress. They are now heavily weighted against the President, against the administration, against labor, against a militant effort to establish the conditions of a lasting social peace. Only a tremendous effort of imagination and restraint on your part will save the Congress and the country.

Of course, you are smart. All of you have survived the great test: you were smart enough to get yourselves elected, often in the face of past legislative records that needed a lot of explaining or ignoring. But does that necessarily mean that you are smart enough to understand the massive issues of our time? In France, where politics were developed to a greater pitch of refinement than anywhere else in the world, some of the governing group were so smart that they maneuvered their country into slavery. In America after World War I the group of congressmen that followed the lead of Senator Lodge outsmarted President Wilson—and lost the peace for us and for the world. Political smartness is a cheap commodity, to be bought and sold in any party back room in the country. If you make up your mind to it, there will be nothing to prevent your outsmarting the New Deal forces, and wrecking labor, liberalism, the war effort. The farm-organization lobbyists now in Washington will encourage you and show you ingenious methods. You can break the price ceilings, destroy the rationing system, pass a tax bill which does nothing about the inflationary gap and which bears most heavily on the low-income groups. You can by restrictive legislation goad the trade unions to the point of sullenness and strikes, and then rouse the country to a fever pitch against them. You can extend the reign of terror against liberals in the administrative agencies.

There will be those among your leaders and spokesmen, among newspaper publishers and NAM careerists, who will encourage these impulses in you. They are your enemies, as they are the enemies of what is best in American life. They will raise the old bloody shirt of bureaucracy again, they will shout about congressional independence. They are not your friends. There are many areas in which you must demand greater publicity for what the administrative agencies do, and recognition by them of the need for consulting Congress and keeping it informed. But congressional independence can become an empty catchword if it leads to government by deadlock or government by pressure whirlpools.

The President's message pointed the way to the greatness of the Seventy-eighth Congress. You may be the Congress to terminate hostilities. You may have the duty of providing the returning soldiers with an America and a world in which they can have jobs and peace. On the first of these two issues, the President said some wise—if self-evident—things about social security. An American counterpart to the Beveridge Report will soon be issued by the National Resources Planning Board: will you have the greatness not to mutilate it? But social security is not adequate to provide jobs: there must also be an economic program for peacetime America, involving the government in spending and in investment controls which many of you will not like. And above all, both jobs and peace will depend on the enlargement of the United Nations into a long-range world federation, with power not only to disarm the enemy countries, but also to use international force against future aggression, and take economic action for the interdependent welfare of all nations.

If you keep your eyes and your minds open, these things will be plain. If you think with your hates and your prejudices, we shall be lost. We shall, no doubt, find ways of punishing individual members among you, in later elections. We may have the strength to apply pressures to you. But a government of pressures and of belated punishments is scarcely a satisfactory one. If you do not rise to a sense of the greatness of the time, there is little we can do. It will be left to a future generation to pursue you with their contempt, and to call you the Congress of little men in a great time.

Giraud and deGaulle

The announcement which a spokesman for General Giraud made early this week, that the French in North Africa and the Fighting French would soon join forces and "throw out all the Vichyites," is good news, but it is not enough. A government composed of Giraud and nominees of General de Gaulle, and purged of all former collaborationists, would be a great improvement on the Darlan-appointed Imperial Council which now rules French North and West Africa and French Morocco, but it would still be a military dictatorship conducted in defiance of the duly-elected government of the territory. We see no reason why, as Varian Fry suggested in last week's New Republic, the Conseils Généraux of the three departments of Algeria should not now be constituted the legal government of all France, to be joined later by the Conseils Généraux of other departments as they are liberated. This is not only the only procedure which is in accordance with French law in the circumstances; it is also the best assurance we can give the French people that our vic-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tory will really mean the return of democratic government.

It Can't Happen Here

Americans who have difficulty understanding the democratic Frenchman's lack of enthusiasm for the present situation in Africa might ask themselves how they would feel if similar things happened here. Suppose that the Germans had somehow occupied a large part of the United States, and that following the occupation, Congress had been dissolved, the President and his Cabinet deposed, and a government of American isolationists had assumed dictatorial powers. Then suppose that the British had invaded American territory and driven the Germans out. If, in doing so, they had ignored the President, the Cabinet and Congress, and had accepted the support and help of the isolationists, how enthusiastic would we be? Suppose that Bert Wheeler remained our Secretary of State, ex-Colonel Lindbergh retained the air force in his hands, Father Coughlin continued to direct our short-wave broadcasts to Europe, Hamilton Fish clung like a leech to his post as Secretary of the Navy, and George Deatherage still ran the FBI. Would we respond readily to appeals from the British to drop politics and unite against the Germans? Or would we too feel that our chances of beating the Germans were seriously compromised by the presence in our front ranks of men who had found nothing to fear from Nazism?

Help the Jews Now

Though it has disappeared from the news, the Nazi campaign against the Jews of Europe has not abated. On the contrary, it seems to have increased in fury in recent months. By the end of October, the ghetto of Warsaw, which once housed 550,000 souls, contained fewer than 35,000; today it may already be completely empty. There is even a report from the Socialist underground in Poland that the Nazis are using the bodies of their Jewish victims to make soap and fertilizer in a factory at Siedlce.

The situation is so tragic, and the need for action so desperately urgent, that we find it hard to understand why the United Nations have not already set up a commission to deal with the problem. Such a commission has long been foreshadowed. Unfortunately, after weeks of talk it still has not taken shape.

One thing such a condition could do at once would be to persuade the neutral countries of Europe to open their doors to Jews fortunate enough to escape, and maintain the refugees in concentration camps, at the expense of the United Nations, for the duration of the war. The neutrals might even be able to persuade the Nazi satellite states to let the Jews go. We understand that one Balkan country which is allied to Germany has nevertheless appealed to the British to let it send its Jewish subjects to Palestine rather than to keep them until the Nazis get around to slaughtering them. The British have in fact already agreed to admit 4,000 Jewish children at once, but Palestine could hold many more, both children and adults.

There is so much that might be done, and so little time to do it—must more precious weeks be wasted before we get started?

The Farmers' NAM

Four conservative organizations of farmers met a few days ago in Washington and laid down a joint program for the coming session of Congress. Their attitude in general is one of bitter hostility to organized labor and to the poor farmers who are aided by the Farm Security Administration. This group wants higher prices for farm products regardless of whether or not this means breaking through price ceilings and the beginnings of inflation. They want the legal work week increased from forty hours to fifty-four, with no overtime payment until after the latter figure has been passed. They oppose the unionization of farm workers and payment of subsidies to marginal producers in order to keep down prices to consumers. They would like to import labor wholesale from Mexico and the West Indies without any annoying interference by government agencies; their attitude on this point was well described by H. L. Mitchell, general secretary of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, in The New Republic of January 11.

We understand that Frank Gannett, the ultra-conservative publisher of a chain of newspapers is boasting that he had much to do with engineering this meeting, and indeed, it sounds like the work of the Committee for Constitutional Government, the hysterical last-ditch group of Tories in which he is the moving spirit. If this is true, the conservative farm groups have probably blundered badly. Gannett represents the lunatic fringe of conservatism, whose support is usually a curse, not a blessing. The group which met in Washington is openly labeling itself the farmers' NAM; it can only hurt its own cause, in our judgment, by doing so.

Minister Flynn

The President's appointment of Boss Edward J. Flynn as Minister to Australia was clearly a blunder. As a matter of practical politics, it has given the new Congress, loaded with Republicans and conservative Democrats, a weapon to turn against the President. Already the Republicans are gleefully raking up the story, never satisfactorily explained, of the publicly owned paving blocks that were used on Flynn's private estate. It is doubtful whether the Senate will confirm the appointment. As a matter of diplomatic strategy in the framework of the war, it is an even greater mistake. Flynn's premature announcement met with an unfavorable reaction in London and silence in Aus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tralia. But this is not so important as the question of vesting a typical New York machine politician with this important and demanding assignment in a difficult theatre of war. President Roosevelt has always felt that he needed the support of the Democratic Party's political machines in the big Northern cities, and it is difficult to say off-hand that he has been wrong. But even if he is right, we question gravely whether there is any excuse for the appointment of a man like Flynn to such a post.

Mr. Parisius

Secretary of Agriculture Wickard has full responsibility for the food situation. He has divided the problem into two parts, production, which he has put in the hands of H. W. Parisius, and distribution, which Roy Hendrickson will administer. Mr. Hendrickson must apportion food supplies to the armed forces, our allies and the conquered areas to see that the quantities available for domestic use are divided properly among various consuming groups. The job that Mr. Parisius undertakes is even tougher. Despite the manpower and equipment shortages, despite the belief among farmers that they are now doing all they can or a little more, he *must* get far more food produced. He must, in particular, get more meat, dairy and poultry products. Victory in the war depends on it.

Little is known of Mr. Parisius save that he is a subordinate in the Department of Agriculture in whom the Secretary has confidence. He begins his crucial job with no enemies. He will soon find plenty of them, if he does his job well. He will serve his country best if, at the outset of his task, he pastes over his desk the parting words of another administrator who had a tough job and did it superbly. "If I had it to do over again," remarked Leon Henderson a few days ago, "I'd be tougher from the start."

Raise the Quotas

In November the Department of Agriculture announced that goals for 1943 food production embraced a 15-percent increase in pork, a 20-percent increase in poultry products and practically no increase in dairy products. This won't do. With a sufficiency of wheat, which is a satisfactory feed for hogs although not normally so considered, pork production could, many experts say, be increased by at least 30 percent. They point out also that a sales campaign that would convince farmers of the practicability of using their brooder houses for two batches of chicks a year could expand production of poultry for meat by more than 50 percent this year. The expansion of beef and dairy products is a slower process.

Mr. Parisius must say plainly what the manpower requirements of a greater dairy production are and fight to attain them. His first fight—within his Department if necessary—must be to raise the present quotas.

A New Bill of Rights

The National Resources Planning Board a short time ago issued an interesting document which deserves a place alongside the lists of new freedoms publicly discussed by President Roosevelt and Vice President Wallace. The NRPB has given us a "new bill of rights," conceived as a supplement to the one embodied in the Constitution. It can be summarized as follows:

1. The right to work.
2. The right to fair play.
3. The right to adequate food, clothing, shelter and medical care.
4. The right to security.
5. The right to live in a system of free political enterprise.
6. The right to freedom from secret political police.
7. The right to equality before the law in *fact*.
8. The right to education.
9. The right to rest and recreation.

There is no pretense that this list is complete, and some of it certainly overlaps the President's and Vice President's new Freedoms. However, the concept of these social advances as "rights," to be added to our present Bill of Rights (although probably not literally as constitutional amendments), is a valuable step forward, and the NRPB's report takes them out of the realm of pious generalities by careful amplification (for example, the almost meaningless "right to live in a system of free enterprise" includes "freedom from compulsory labor, irresponsible private power, arbitrary public authority and unregulated monopolies"). In addition, there are 117 specific questions, defining the problems, like "regional participation," which must be solved in connection with the new rights.

The Tragic Decade

"PEACE AND WAR," the long introduction to a forthcoming White Paper by the Department of State, is a document tragic in its stature, covering the most violent period in the known history of the world. We use the word "tragic" in its classic sense, as tragedy was understood by the greatest dramatists who ever wrote—the ancient Greeks. Tragedy is not meaningless misfortune and suffering. It is something that happens to a person important enough to symbolize the most deeply human qualities of us all. Its function as a work of art is, as Aristotle said, purgation of our pity and fear. A tragedy is closely knit; it proceeds from cause to consequence, arousing thereby a sense of the inevitability of fate. We see the protagonist twisting in the toils of necessity, hoping to come through, yet fearing failure; the action rises to a climax and then descends to the ordained doom. But the protagonist is not just a helpless victim of something entirely outside himself. For, as Aristotle also

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said, tragedy deals with the struggle and eventual downfall of a good but not wholly guiltless man.

The protagonist in this drama is the United States of America—or possibly, if one wishes to draw a still closer analogy, President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The fate against which he is struggling is the approach of a terrible world war. From the beginning, signs and omens forecast that which he most fears. He is torn by two conflicting impulses—to withdraw and guard his safety, hoping by his example to calm the passions of others, or to intervene by organizing a peaceful community of nations. He steps now in the one direction, now in the other. But both, in crisis after crisis, fail.

In each crisis he addresses eloquent exhortations to the prospective breaker of the peace, calling on him to consult his sacred obligations, his higher nature, his ultimate self-interest. The aggressor is assured that he has nothing to fear, that he can gain all legitimate ends peacefully. He is warned of the terrible consequences if he does not stay his hand. But all the time, the protagonist is told, by those who know, that the aggressor is mad and cannot be stopped by words. And when the words have been ignored, the international madman is excoriated, again eloquently.

Finally comes the climax when the great phase of the war is about to begin. Almost without hope now, but feverishly grasping at every straw, the President again and again implores all concerned to wait, to negotiate, to accept mediation. He even asks Mussolini to use his influence with Hitler. But of course it is to no avail. From this time onward the country seems to resign itself, though little by little and reluctantly, to involvement in the catastrophe. In late 1941 comes the long negotiations with Japan in a final effort to reach a broad basis of understanding, though all the time we know that no promise of the enemy is to be trusted. We even consider a meeting between the President and the Japanese Premier in the mid-Pacific. But even before the negotiations are broken off, the bombs fall on Pearl Harbor.

It is all here, from the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931 to the Japanese attack on us in 1941. On August 13, 1932, Ambassador Grew warned from Tokyo that animosity against the United States and other nations was being deliberately fomented, that the Japanese military machine had been "built for war," felt prepared for war, and would "welcome war"; that it had never been beaten and possessed unlimited self-confidence. On June 26, 1933, Consul-General George S. Messersmith warned from Berlin that some of the men running the government were "psychopathic cases" and others were in a state of exaltation that knew no reason; that while Germany's rulers wanted peace for the present to build up her armament and prepare her people psychologically, they were headed toward war and wanted to make the nation "the most capable instrument of war that has ever existed." These and other warnings were repeated. There was no tendency or plan on the part of the aggressors which was not faithfully and promptly reported to Washington. The warnings were taken seriously by the President and Secretary Hull. They were expressed, in general terms, to the people of this country and, in more specific terms, to the representatives of the various powers concerned.

Yet with an almost superhuman patience, our government kept trying to persuade the ambitious nations to disarm, to negotiate reciprocal-trade treaties, not to undertake aggression and to stop where they were after they had undertaken it. Our people intensified their resolve not to fight again, and Congress under their pressure passed the various neutrality acts. Though the President disapproved of the clause requiring that embargoes be applied in all cases against both parties at war, he himself called for and adopted the same principle in the civil war between the republicans and fascists in Spain. We pushed the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere, hoping it would be an example to the rest of the world. Slowly and far behind others, we took to rearmament. Even after the general war had begun we refused to admit defeat in our efforts until it was almost too late.

When, on June 14, 1940, the German troops entered Paris and Premier Reynaud cabled President Roosevelt that unless the United States could offer France the certainty that we would promptly enter the war, "the fate of the world will change" and "you will see France go under like a drowning man and disappear after having cast a last long look towards the land of liberty from which she awaited salvation," the best that Mr. Roosevelt could reply was that we would send an increasing quantity of supplies, but that only Congress could make military commitments.

If the White Paper is conceived as propaganda to prove that our country did not want war, neither its people nor its government, that it made inexhaustible efforts to prevent the outbreak of war, and did not go to war itself until it was forced to do so by attack on our territory, it proves its point. It adds the weight of many thousands of pertinent and demonstrably true words to what most people in the world, barring the Axis propagandists, would admit in a sentence.

But to conceive it merely as proof of our innocence is to miss the whole depth and point of the tragedy. We were, as we now know, too innocent. We were good, but by no means wholly guiltless. Our guilt lay in wishful thinking which blinded us to the meaning of obvious and unwelcome facts, and hence in too long a delay in dealing with those facts. It lay in not understanding the madness of those who were to threaten us, yes, it lay even in a share of the original responsibility for that madness. It lay in an attitude toward life which was incapable of dealing effectively with its darker realities, which attempted first to ignore,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

then to escape them, whether by isolation or by reasonable persuasion.

Now, we think, we know better. At least we understand the past ten years, and have spurred ourselves to make the sacrifices necessary to repair our mistakes. But do we understand the present as well as the past? Do we understand the coming decade, which is growing toward birth within the present? Shall we be as nobly ineffectual in analyzing the underlying causes of our misfortune, so that we fail to prevent the same tangle of inevitability from trapping us again? The man who has participated in this tragedy may feel its purgation of pity and fear, but he will have missed its burden if he does not search his soul and the world for a way to avoid any more such futility, no matter how noble it may be.

Conditions at Camp Harmony

SOME MONTHS AGO The New Republic published an article by Ted Nakashima, an American of the Japanese race who was at the time an inmate of an assembly center. Although his article did not say so, it was Camp Harmony, Puyallup, Washington. Mr. Nakashima's main point was that he is a loyal American, who was engaged on important war work (as an architect drawing plans for houses to be occupied by defense-plant workers) and that he strongly resented being obliged to go and live instead in the virtual idleness of an assembly center. Incidentally, he complained of some of the physical conditions at the center.

The United States Army took exception to certain of these statements made by Mr. Nakashima. At the army's request, The New Republic sent a special investigator to Camp Harmony to check Mr. Nakashima's statements. We publish herewith summaries of the criticisms and of the facts as reported by our investigator.

Mr. Nakashima said the inmates of Camp Harmony are confined to quarters at nine and that lights must be out at ten.

Comment: The regulations on this matter have varied from time to time and from camp to camp. When our investigator visited Camp Harmony, the curfew was at ten o'clock and lights must be out at ten-thirty. This seems not unreasonable in a camp with many old people and small children.

Mr. Nakashima said there were no fresh meats, vegetables or butter, that the evacués had to stand in line for meals in the rain and mud, that dishes and silverware were dirty, and there was milk only for children.

Comment: For a short time at the beginning, certainly not more than a month, the evacués got the United States Army "B" ration. They had small quantities of fresh meat, green vegetables and butter. Thereafter they got the army "A" ration, with plenty of all these things. Some of the older Japanese Americans objected to the American food, because they wanted rice. There seems no doubt that the conditions of which Mr. Nakashima complains were temporary and unimportant.

If dishes and silverware were dirty, this was a reflection on the evacués, and not on the American authorities, since the evacués were in charge of dishwashing.

The charge was made that a broken sewer was insanitary and unpleasant.

Comment: A sewer line did break, but was repaired as soon as possible and there have been no further accidents of this kind.

Mr. Nakashima complained that the camp was guarded by men armed with machine guns, with orders to shoot if the evacués came too close to the barbed wire.

Comment: It is true there are armed guards and barbed wire. It is also true that the evacués were ordered not to walk on the grass within ten feet of the barbed-wire fences. There are not, however, any orders to shoot, and the rule about keeping off the grass is widely disobeyed without penalty.

In general it may be said that some of Mr. Nakashima's criticisms were exaggerated, and that those that were true referred to temporary conditions which were ameliorated shortly after Mr. Nakashima wrote his article (but not as a result of his writing, so far as we know). Conditions at this camp, except for the first few weeks, have been as good as could reasonably be expected by anyone. While the problem of what to do about the Japanese Americans in the long run remains unsolved, the army's part in setting up and maintaining proper conditions in the camps has been carried out satisfactorily. Certainly there can be no doubt that our treatment of persons of the Japanese race has been infinitely better than has been the case with Americans who have been captured or interned by the Japanese.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Managing Editor: THOMAS SANCTON

Literary Editor: ALFRED KAZIN

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: BYRON DEXTER, ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, JULIAN HUXLEY, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Smoldering Constitutional Crisis

WE RE-ELECT FDR—and the opposition is installed within the government. The cause which failed to persuade the voters scores an easy victory in Washington. The democratic process operates, yet it is by-passed. Somehow a wedge has been driven between the exercise of power and its popular source. A constitutional crisis impends which makes insistent the question, Whose government?

In a sense a sport has been thrown up by the war. Yet the war has done little more than accelerate trends long in the making. For our political order is undergoing revolution. The three-in-one system—executive, legislature, judiciary—was never so neat as we liked to believe. It still operates in a criss-cross sort of way, but its authority wanes. And a new order, almost unknown to political theory, arises in an area hitherto little occupied. For economic law did not live up to its Newtonian promise; laissez-faire got a bad name; the newly felt necessities of the people came to be of political concern. So the government was called upon to prod, regulate, underwrite, complement, supplant free enterprise. And a host of agencies sprang into being—to put an increasing strain upon the separation of state and economy.

As the barriers fell, the government had to be made over. A state accustomed to letting business alone was not ideally adapted to public control. The need was for a continuous oversight of interests, industries, activities which were unlike and refused to stay put. To this demand for specifics, Congress could respond only with general statutes. It could not act promptly and concretely every time novelty in a situation signaled for a change in remedy. The legislature was most useful in a crisis, when some affair left to itself had broken down and something had to be done about it. On such an occasion it might choose values and point direction; but even then it could do little more than pass an enabling act. It had to delegate actual regulation to some authority which could apply general provisions to particular cases and changing conditions. Only after experience had shown legislation to be inadequate or out-of-date did it have to return to the particular job. It still inquires; it retains a seriously compromised power over the purse. But its power to shape policy is in decline. Its great days are over.

If Congress has moved back-stage, the judiciary has been pushed to the side-lines. In the days when laissez-faire was rampant and respectable, free enterprise was quite able to take care of itself. As the trend toward control made headway, the judiciary came out of the cloister and put up a furious fight in its behalf. But against the current of the times its pretensions had hard going. In a glorious twilight the Supreme Court made a gallant last stand against the President's "unpacking plan"—and then, in a self-denying ordinance, quietly surrendered judicial supremacy. The result was inevitable; for as an agency of industrial government the court was poorly equipped for the task of continuous oversight. The way of litigation is too expensive and cumbersome for everyday use. The interests at stake cannot all be crowded into the rigid forms of a case in controversy. Its tempo is too slow for a world in a hurry; its channels, too narrow for the heavy traffic of the business system. In the lament of a distinguished jurist, that an official attempt to stop hot oil has outrun the decorous—and interminable—processes of justice, a useful institution is caught off its beat. It may now and then barge in to vex and to harass; for the form of myopia called legalism is an occupational disease to which judges are peculiarly susceptible. But no longer can the judiciary direct policy.

An instrument of control, simpler, speedier, more flexible than court or Congress became essential. It was the market which had broken down or flunked its social task. It was to correct the market that the state was called to action. A shipper cannot bargain with the railroad over the price of the haul—the Interstate Commerce Commission comes into being. The investor lacks the skills with which to judge stocks and bonds—the Securities and Exchange Commission is the answer. The law of supply and demand fails to adjust the acreage of staple crops to market demand—the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is sent to the rescue. The private sources of capital, especially in a depression, shrink from risk—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation underwrites a hesitant free enterprise. The individual wage-earner is no longer a match for the corporate employer—the National Labor Relations Board is called upon to ensure "that equality in bargaining power in which freedom of contract begins." The impact blurs —and even erases—frontiers between the separate provinces.

State and economy are alike changed by the contact. The business unit becomes the corporate estate. Price, output, capacity are put under managerial control; company policy becomes an aspect of the politics of industry. The government adopts the mechanisms of business and widely employs the corporate device to organize its activities. A few years ago the National Recovery Administration put on a dress rehearsal of business as a political institution. As the war approached the President made corporate entities our accredited agents in the mobilization of material resources. He seems to have taken it for granted that they were powerful and selfish and would enlist their domains in the war effort only upon their own terms. So today the War Production Board, a kind of House of Delegates

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for large-scale enterprise, decrees capacity, regulates output, apportions materials, gears the economy to the military struggle. The state takes over where the economy cannot perform; the economy does delegated duty for the state.

It has all come about without goal or plan. An event, a social shift, a new awareness creates an unexpected situation. The need or breakdown is recorded in an improvised control. As creatures of occasions many of these agencies are amorphous, uncertain of their tasks, unsure of their places. No art has deftly shaped them to the different sorts of work they have to do. Their number is so large that alphabetical combinations must be invoked to name them. Among them is every form of organization, association, corporation known to man. Whether an agency meets the world as bureau, division, authority or corporate subsidiary is not important. Nor does it matter greatly whether it reports to another agency, to a cabinet member, to Congress, or to the President. Even controls which overlap and get tangled are nothing to worry about. They are everyday matters in a society whose affairs are interlocked. A government which does not keep ahead of any blueprint has lost its vitality. The real concern is that the whole establishment is drifting away from responsible government.

If there is need for political reform, it is to impress office and order upon this motley host. The older channels for the public will not have been extended to the newer establishment. The three great powers of government are no longer separate and two of them are no longer great. The judiciary, aloof from popular currents of feeling, cannot do the work of the administrative agencies. Nor can it effectively police their activities. A group with everyday experience in what-it-is-about has it all over a bench of judges who must be jacks of all trades. As against the research facilities available to any commission, the fact-finding of the courts is primitive. And remote control, however wise, is no substitute for judgment on the spot. The Congress can create an agency, abate its authority, fit it out with new weapons. It can, through public hearings, expose sloth, muddling, incompetence. But it is impotent to conduct the demands of the people through the whole political order. And it can more easily sterilize than it can give life. The Executive has risen to supremacy; he lords it, so far as anyone does, over this vast and recently occupied territory.

The Executive has been exalted; yet his enlarged authority has grown up in a domain unknown to the Constitution. The establishment is too vast for one man to oversee, too intricate for any man to understand. As a nerve-center the White House is poorly connected with outlying departments. And the President has quite different powers over the various agencies. His example, a new appointment, the call to be up-and-doing make for alertness. But persuasion and command, even if uniformly applied, encounter different degrees of resistance. And his term may be spent before the will which swept him into office is carried very far along. As the executive order replaces the Act of Congress, "the King's ear" again becomes a political institution. But access to it, as yet grooved into no due process, goes by chance, proximity, the favor of the secretariat. A question of importance may be resolved upon inadequate information; a decision may reach interested parties by hearsay. Instead of notice, hearing, a channel open to all concerned, it becomes necessary to find someone who is blessed with the proper entree.

At his utmost the President cannot overcome the disposition of agencies to go their separate ways. The spirit of the Interstate Commerce Commission is that of the age of T.R. The Federal Trade Commission is a monument to Woodrow Wilson's attempt to fix a moral plane for competition. The philosophy of Herbert Hoover lives on in the investment policy of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Securities and Exchange Commission behaves as if these were still the palmy days of the New Deal. The War Production Board is the very incarnation of an attempt to run a war from the business office. And the State Department, in the tradition of an archaic chivalry, insists upon arming the nations we must fight. If each agency were sovereign within its own dominion, we might sport a panorama of all the controls. But any major problem—raw materials, synthetic rubber, transport, manpower, the standard of life—involves a multiplex of authorities. It can usually be resolved only by inter-departmental diplomacy. And in such a resort pressures count, only the exceptional case can go to the White House, and the-difference-it-makes fades into the background. In the everlasting clash of persons, interests, agencies, national policy serves many masters.

Its very independence exposes an agency to internal and external dangers. A new office is likely to reflect the vitality of the crusade which brought it into being. As age comes, it hardens, formalizes its action, generates a tradition, takes the sterile way of establishment. It is almost as prone as a large corporation—Alcoa, U. S. Steel, Anaconda, American Tel. and Tel.—to go bureaucratic. Its salvation is a nucleus of live officials who persist in sticking their necks out. And it takes eternal vigil to protect it against dry rot, ceremonial, loss of function. The agency is peculiarly susceptible to minority influence. Its task is to mediate between some private interest in the commonwealth and its public. The interest is compact, well defined, insistent upon its rights, alert. Its public is scattered, absorbed in its own affairs, inarticulate. All the advantage of power, knowledge, monies with which to manufacture argument, are with the private group. A close decision turns upon pressure, not in general, but at the point of conflict. Here the interest can mobilize its resources, keep the heat on, wear opposition down; the public concern is usually too dissipated to meet the onslaught. A number

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of contingencies aid the private cause. The officials of the agency occupy a dual office; the rule of arbiter is likely to overtop that of public guardian. The Civil Service has done much to remove political, but far less to abate corporate, patronage. As yet it has devised no adequate test for vision, devotion to the public interest, guts. The government exhibits no unusual gratitude to faithful servants; the interest can often open careers to "fair-minded" young men. And routine and inertia are enlisted under the banner of do-nothing.

All along the frontier of control a concentrated private interest is pitted against a diffused public interest. The interest is willing to go along if the agency is "coöperative." If it is not, ways can be found to render it impotent. Witness the judicial review which for years paralyzed the work of rate-making bodies; or note the quiet demise of the National Labor Relations Board. The Supreme Court only recently put a stop to the parade of corporate privileges as the rights of man to claim immunity from the law. But if the members of an industry want to string along together, keep others out, divide markets, share the spoils, an agency of control may prove a positive asset. If it can be captured, it may become a branch office within the government. Then it can lend a sanction to acts which otherwise would be illegal. Milk control is a mighty prop to a rigid price structure; patents have been employed to bless many a monopoly.

If a nation cannot keep its own creations in line, it must expect trouble from the business concerns through which it acts. Corporations consecrated to the pursuit of gain have a terrific kick-back when employed in the public service. A primary precaution is to condition them for delegated duty. Yet no criteria of fitness have been set up for dollar-a-year men. Those called have come far more largely from the business office than from the production line; among them salesmen far outnumber technicians. There has been regard for "acquaintance with the industry," but the nature of that acquaintance has been little specified. Few are at home with the kind of questions which the current crisis brings to the economy. To Washington they bring the attitudes, habits, goals and fears of acquisitive enterprise. A public official—his name ought to be given—exhibits his confusion by proclaiming the "indispensability" of persons whose special competence lies in keeping output down and prices up. It is no wonder that corporate-public officials, in reference to the government and the industry, are stumped over the antecedents of the pronouns "we" and "they." Every decision made involves a choice between alternatives and leaves its lasting impression.

It is elementary to the law that "no one shall try his own case." Yet a business executive, in his public capacity, makes decisions which affect his competitors. It is a common practice for him to have a voice in the terms of the contract when he has a stake in the outcome. Officials, with conflicting obligations, as officers of the state are giving shape to things to come. We convert public funds into private capital; make private citizens architects of the political economy; employ our worshipful companies as departments of government. Yet alien structure has not been adapted to government use. And we have not even fumbled with the problem of imposing responsibility.

Such an institution is a product of volcanic transition. Yet, in their sharp departure from the older pattern, the war agencies present a trend everywhere in evidence. A score of forces move to separate the operating government from the popular sources of power. Divisions, bureaus, commissions are concerned with technical problems. It is not easy to translate their decisions into language which the layman can understand. Usually they move case by case; a policy may be set before its direction becomes generally apparent. Officials are prone to enlarge their authority and sanctions are sought to hide their discretion from critical scrutiny. There is a domain—though not a large one—where "military" or some like necessity may caution secrecy. But the excuse easily becomes a mask for irresponsibility; and the advantage it obtains is small compared with the utter demoralization it brings to public opinion. The official who presumes to withhold from the people what they ought to know is imitating the enemy he professes to fight. A slant to the news is perhaps unavoidable; but as a mark of artifice it becomes suspect. A great part of our current propaganda is ineffective. It seems to be designed to sell us something rather than to make articulate the aspirations of common men in this crisis. If the stream of intelligence does not flow, the democratic process cannot operate. Yet many things move to close or corrupt it and few to keep it open. The ancient glory of Congress flames most vividly in its power of inquiry. The critical work of the Bone, Murray and Truman committees has exposed situations badly in need of surgery and brought to the people facts to which they are entitled. But such resources are inadequate. Congress cannot direct and supervise the whole structure of alphabetical agencies. And, as matters now go, they are even further beyond the reach of the electorate.

In the election of 1942 the dilemma stands sharply out. Administration does not operate as representative government. The will of the people moves in one domain; the real questions of policy lie in another. It was the work of the various agencies about which men were concerned; it was the conduct of Congress which was taken to the polls. The people knew, at least vaguely, of the Knudsen fiasco, the great capital strike, the business deals with the Axis, the muddling of manpower, the trading with the enemy, the union of militancy and appeasement, the bungling in respect to oil, steel, aluminum, synthetic rubber. Yet they could not express resentment against the men who had blundered

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or betrayed; they could only blindly turn out Senators and Representatives who had little to do with it. The anomaly of a people's President, operating through key persons, between whom and himself there was mutual distrust, was made to order for the opposition. They were entrenched in power; yet, since responsibility lay with the Executive, they had a perfect alibi at the polls for all their mistakes. It has been said again and again that the election marks a swing to the right. Fortune magazine seems nearer the mark in holding it to be a rebuke to the President because he would not—or could not—purge. Should the people not be consulted about the men and measures which shape their destinies? And how else could they protest against being ruled by a group whom they had rejected with their ballots?

The government moves into a new orbit; yet order and office have not followed. There is no easy way of getting real questions of policy—enlarging personal opportunity, ensuring the economy against breakdown, advancing the standard of life, laying the foundations of a durable peace—raised. And adequate answers can emerge only from an almost miraculous conjunction of unlike wills. In our order of society, agencies of control must be expert, flexible, able to act with speed. But they must be informed, considerate of interests involved, responsive to the public will. As the state changes in character, it occupies an area where the older safeguards do not operate. Our friends to the right, sensitive to the trend, have not been idle. They have attempted to move "independent agencies" under judicial, and away from popular, authority. And, as judicial review runs into difficulties, they set out to capture—or to sabotage—the new controls. The counter task, at which our liberals have made far less headway, is to contrive ways and means for subduing these agencies to the democratic process. A clash of President and Congress is a gallant sideshow; the breach which threatens disaster is between a popular executive and an operative government which the voters cannot reach. Unless "we the people" can make the industrial system the instrument of the general welfare, the dominant interests will take over the government. For the separation of state and economy is gone. WALTON HAMILTON

Los Angeles' Pachuco Gangs

IT TAKES A WAR apparently to reveal the "sore spots" in our society. For at least twenty-five years, social investigators have repeatedly warned the County of Los Angeles about the thoroughly disadvantaged position of its large resident Mexican population; but the community saw fit to ignore these warnings until, with the war, it became impossible to pretend that no problem existed. The trouble started in August, 1942, with a so-called "gang murder" at Sleepy Lagoon—a mud hole used by Mexican youngsters as a swimming pool for want of better facilities. Following this incident, the police launched a systematic round-up of Mexican youngsters. With the newspapers carrying banner headlines announcing that the "Kid Gloves Are Off" (they were never on, in fact), a veritable reign of police terror was unleashed. More than three hundred Mexican youngsters were grabbed in one mass raid. Throughout these arrests, the newspapers prominently featured the word "Mexican" and, in almost a matter of hours, the Axis propagandists got busy on short-wave broadcasts to Central and South America, calling attention, in a highly exaggerated manner, to the mass arrests.

Some 219,000 Mexicans reside in Los Angeles County and, of this group, about 36,410 are between the ages of six and seventeen. It is no secret that this second-generation group has faced discrimination in the schools, in the community generally, and that, like most second-generation groups (particularly when a degree of color difference also exists), these youngsters show evidence of social and cultural maladjustment. This maladjustment explains the rise of the so-called Mexican "gangs." There are some forty or fifty of these "pachuco" gangs in Los Angeles ("pachuco" being a slang expression for those who come from El Paso). The pachuco boys affect drape coats that fall to their knees, pants hitched up almost to their armpits, with peg-top bottoms. So tight are their pants at the bottom, that some of them have to be slit and zipped up. Going in for broad-brimmed hats, the boys let their hair grow long and comb it straight back in two black wings that meet at the back of the head in a little top-knot. Dolled up in these fancy zoot suits and racing around in cut-down and hopped-up jalopies, the pachuco gangs have occasioned much sensational publicity. Fundamentally, there is nothing wrong with these youngsters, but, for want of a satisfactory adjustment to their environment, their energies have taken this form of expression.

Shortly after the mass arrests occurred, Capt. Edward Duran-Ayres, of the local sheriff's office, issued a long report to the grand jury in which he attributed the antics of these youngsters to the "biological" predisposition of the Mexican to "criminal tendencies." Unsatisfied with this report, the grand jury, largely through the splendid leadership of two members, Mr. H. W. Henderson and Mr. Harry Braverman, demanded an open public hearing on the entire question. At this hearing, the grand jury heard from Walter H. C. Laves, of the Office of the Coördinator of Inter-American

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Affairs, Guy T. Nunn, of the Manpower Commission, Manuel Aguilar, Mexican consul, Oscar Fuss of the CIO, Dr. Harry Hoijer, distinguished anthropologist of the University of California, and myself as Chief of the Division of Immigration and Housing. The hearing did much to counteract the disastrous effect of the high-handed police tactics and paved the way for a subsequent visit to Los Angeles of Alan Cranston of the OWI, who succeeded in bringing about a noticeable change in the tone and character of newspaper reporting on the Mexican problem.

For the time being, the issue has simmered down, but it has by no means died out. There is some plausible evidence pointing to the conclusion that the local branch of the Sinarquistas is bent on making trouble in Los Angeles and that the activities and propaganda of the Sinarquista movement have had some effect upon Mexican youth in Los Angeles. School teachers report acts and statements of Mexican youngsters which indicate a conscious political motivation of a character that one would not expect in the absence of some indirect stimulation. While the public-relations aspect of the problem has been improved, the cultural conflict remains. It has its roots deep in the background of Mexican immigration to California and it is not likely to be removed in the absence of an affirmative federal program designed to improve the living and working conditions of resident Mexicans and to eliminate the prevalent social and economic discrimination. The Office of the Coördinator of Inter-American Affairs is fully aware of the nature of the problem and its ramifications, but, to date, it has been frustrated by rulings of the Director of the Budget which make it impossible, apparently, for the Coördinator to spend funds for the improvement of Latin American relations inside the United States.

CAREY MCWILLIAMS

Los Angeles

Techniques for a Post-War World

Peacemaking Has Begun: III

THE SECOND ARTICLE OF THIS SERIES discussed the need for international economic institutions to achieve freedom from want and knit the nations together in pursuit of a common purpose. It proposed the following new instruments: an international investment agency, a series of development corporations, an international labor-standards agency and an international trade agency. The present article will attempt briefly to suggest the nature of these agencies and how they would operate.

1. *The International Investment Agency* is a suggestion discussed in many quarters, the original idea being derived from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the United States. Let us for present purposes call it the United Nations Bank.

It would be set up by international agreement, and would be governed by a board of directors representing not merely the nations which have a surplus for foreign investment, but also those in which investment would presumably take place. It would have a capital —$10,000,000,000 has been suggested—to be subscribed by the participating nations in proportion to their several national incomes, probably in gold. Thus the United States would find a constructive use for part of its gold hoard. The capital would not, however, entitle the owners of shares to votes in proportion to their holdings, the voting being arranged as in a coöperative association to give adequate voice to consumer nations. Nor would the shares earn interest or profits.

The Bank would be empowered to issue its own securities for public sale anywhere in the world, for long terms and at low rates of interest. These securities could be bought by governments, banks, insurance companies or individuals, just like government bonds. They would be guaranteed by the participating governments, in proportion to capital subscriptions.

In addition, the United Nations Bank would be permitted to issue credit, backed by its capital and surplus, for certain specific purposes of international benefit, such as exchange stabilization and the financing of stabilization pools of commodities.

The capital could be used for public works on a worldwide scale, of the kind which ordinarily earn no direct financial return, but stimulate economic activity and provide facilities for trade and communication. The Pan American Highway is an example of an appropriate type of project. As the benefits of this kind of activity appeared, additional subscriptions for new projects might be made by the participating nations, perhaps on the principle of grants-in-aid for public works by the United States Government to the states. Or the earned surplus of the Bank might be similarly invested in international public property.

The money obtained by sales of the Bank's securities would be used for developmental projects from which a financial return could be expected, such as railroads, power systems, harbor developments, reclamation and other agricultural projects, housing and the like. A regional development like the TVA could be financed in part by the Bank's non-interest-bearing capital and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in part by the proceeds of its securities. The non-interest-bearing capital would be appropriate for flood-control, the securities for power installations.

It should be noted that under this scheme there would be no issues by the Bank constituting a mortgage on specific properties—such, for instance, as first-mortgage fives on a given Brazilian railroad. Every bond sold would be a claim on the entire earnings of the Bank, while the Bank would pool its earnings (and losses) in meeting the claims. Thus the bond-holder would have the advantage of a sort of world public investment trust, rather than having to watch particular investments in distant places, while the borrowing nation or agency would have the advantage of low interest rates, long terms, and dealings with an international agency rather than with a single imperialist power or exploitative financial group.

In making investments, the Bank would attempt mainly to stimulate an expanding world economy and the increase of levels of living in the countries where investments were made. It would provide for amortization of its investments out of profits of the several projects, and for reinvestment of the money repaid in the countries undergoing development. In so doing it would render its investments more secure, since only in an expanding economy are international obligations safe. It would by the same process continually turn over to local ownership and management an increasing share in the projects. Economists know that reinvestment of profits from international loans in the countries where the profits are made has an exceedingly healthy effect on international balances of payments, and so on stability of exchanges and the ability to meet capital charges. It was through this sort of practice that Britain maintained financial stability and the worldwide use of the London money market in the nineteenth century.

International investment in private business concerns could continue to be made as before, but the United Nations Bank should exercise supervision over it through agencies like the SEC and the foreign offices of the various governments, with a view to making sure that it was productive, not extortionate to the borrower or recipient of capital, and did not lay too heavy a burden on international payments.

2. *Development Authorities* of various kinds would be necessary to make use of the money invested by the United Nations Bank, to plan, execute and administer the projects.

There might, for instance, be a South American Transportation Authority to build up a coördinated system of railways, roads, water transportation, airlines and terminal facilities on a continental basis. It is amazing how little the Latin American countries now trade with each other in comparison with the extent to which they trade with North America and Europe, and how lacking they are in the facilities for doing so. Yet continental markets and access to materials are necessary for any broad industrialization program.

There might be an Upper Amazon Development Authority to tap the rich resources of that region, make it habitable, set up power systems, etc. Agricultural projects either for technical crops, or, better still, diversification of food production for domestic consumption, offer another opportunity. If China is to be industrialized, great projects of many sorts are needed there. There is, of course, the proposal for a "TVA for the Danube Valley," made famous by the ridicule of the retiring president of the National Association of Manufacturers. These are merely illustrations of the immense array of possibilities.

There might be a single international development corporation, set up as a subsidiary of the United Nations Bank. But in any case, other kinds would be needed. Some might be created by individual nations in which the work was to be done. Others might be joint undertakings of several nations directly concerned. It is probable that the international authority would have some participation in the management of each, at least at the beginning.

Since large developmental work is almost universally considered the proper function of government, and there is in addition a worldwide trend to socialization, these authorities would be public enterprises, even when they engaged in manufacture or trade. In countries which wished to encourage private enterprise, they would, however, blaze a trail for it, and would lay out a framework for its performance. In countries which desired a higher degree of socialization, they would be equally applicable. Even a nation like the Soviet Union could participate in the system, on the one hand by governmental contributions to the capital of the United Nations Bank and purchase of its securities, and on the other hand by acceptance of funds for developmental authorities within its borders, if it desired to employ foreign capital.

It is little realized how construction projects have stimulated industrial development and rising standards of living in the past, and how large a part public contributions have played in financing these projects. In the United States, for instance, the railroad-building era was the foundation of our industrial growth, and the companies were subsidized by large grants of public land and money. Later the automobile industry carried the load of expansion, and was enabled to do so by the tremendous public-road program. This plan merely applies the same principle on an international scale, and with more regard to orderly development and exclusion of financial chicanery.

International developmental loans have been made by the United States during the war, chiefly in Latin America. As is natural, they have been mainly for the purpose of producing strategic materials for export to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak.

this country. There is no fault to be found with that, but one trouble with foreign investment in the past, from the point of view of a healthy world economy, has been its large degree of concentration on extractive industries in the "backward regions," producing goods destined for export, without enlarging the industrial base for a higher level of living on the part of the native populations. More attention will have to be paid to a rounded development and to production for the domestic market. The nations concerned, if given a full voice in international control, may be trusted to see that this is done.

3. *An International Labor Standards Agency* would be entrusted with the function of seeing that international investment did not result in exploitation of labor. It would set minimum standards in the employment policies of development authorities. Of course it could not at once raise wages everywhere to the level in the United States or even to that in industrial Europe, but it would shade standards up from those prevailing in the various regions, on the principle of the Walsh-Healy Act. The International Labor Office of the League of Nations is well suited to this task. In addition to supervising labor standards in the ordinary sense, it would take a special interest in matters like nutrition, health and housing.

The work of the International Labor Organization in drafting conventions to govern conditions of labor generally in the ratifying countries could continue as before the war, and with more hope of success when linked with a dynamic international organization to expand production and provide full employment. It would, of course, play a large part in the extension of social security, and might in the end produce an improved Beveridge plan for the world.

4. *An International Trade Agency*, though less discussed than the first three proposals, would have several indispensable functions.

First, it would have the duty of supervising all international commodity agreements, in the interest of justice to the consumer. Commodity agreements to restrict output and stabilize prices are in the main a phenomenon of a contracting economy, and would be less justifiable if depression could be avoided and popular purchasing power kept expanding, a task which the other elements in the plan would endeavor to accomplish. Even with rising standards of living, however, there might be genuine surpluses of such crops as wheat and sugar, through the substitution of higher-cost foods and a better balanced diet. In such cases the consumers should be guaranteed full representation in the fixing of quotas and prices. Also, where a permanent cut in production is contemplated, a scheme should be adopted to eliminate the higher-cost producers, and to use the labor, and if possible the land as well, for production of something of which there was not a surplus—for example, substituting local food crops for sugar in the West Indies.

Equally important would be the supervision of cartels which restrict production in the interest of monopoly profits, such as have existed in metals and chemical products. These are mainly the creation of private capital, and should be subject to international public control. Failing other means of bringing them to terms, the agency could in many cases point out to the international bank the need and possibility of additional production or production of substitutes, and public development corporations could be formed to compete with the private monopolies.

As a complement to its control of agreements restricting output of commodities, this agency could be empowered to give temporary relief to producers when market surpluses arose which were not expected to be permanent. This it would do on the "ever normal granary" principle, buying and storing the surplus, and either distributing it through relief agencies to those who could not afford to buy or holding it until prices rose and a shortage appeared.

Finally, and most important of all, would be a duty which we hope need never be exercised—that of denying supplies to any nation which gave evidence of preparing for aggression by increasing its armament contrary to international agreement, or which otherwise seriously defied international sovereignty. Of course national embargoes would be required in doing so, but an international agency is necessary to make a world embargo anywhere near watertight. In this respect it would act like an international Board of Economic Warfare, buying goods to keep them out of the hands of the potential enemy as well as supervising exports and administering blacklists.

One function—that of untangling the knots of unbalanced international payments, depreciated exchange, bilateral barter agreements, exchange blocking, one-way gold flow and other obstructions to trade, would have to be performed by these agencies in coöperation.

A world currency is of course possible to conceive, but it will hardly eventuate from this war, though there might be a single currency for Europe. No kind of currency reform, however, can be a substitute for the correction of deeper maladjustments.

To deal with short-run fluctuations there might be set up, either under the Bank or under the Trade Agency, an international exchange clearing center, where the deficits or surpluses of the various countries would be set off against one another, and temporary support would be given to any weak exchange by stabilization-fund procedure. This could be supplemented by the buying of surplus commodities in the country having a deficit of exchange because of shrinkage of exports.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But such measures do not suffice when a given nation has a continual deficit in its balance of international payments, or another country a continual surplus. This has now been the case for many years; for instance, Latin American countries have had deficits and the United States has had a surplus. The only good this has done us has been defaults of foreign debts and the acquisition of most of the world's gold.

Our protective tariff policy has contributed to this result, but it is not the principal cause, nor would worldwide free trade change the situation. If, for instance, we lowered our tariff so as to buy more goods from South America, South Americans would use their extra purchasing power to buy more goods from us. The volume of trade would be increased, but the unequal balance of payments would remain.

Juggling the relative exchange values of currencies would not long remedy the situation, either. By revaluating the dollar we might make it cheaper for us to buy abroad and more expensive for foreigners to buy here—for a while, but if we actually sold less abroad we should probably buy less as well, and a shifting of internal prices would restore the original disparity.

The real trouble is one that we can see illustrated within the United States, which has a uniform currency and no internal tariffs at all. Ever since the last war, there has been a disparity between the prices of agricultural products and the prices of manufactured goods. Those engaged in manufacture have gained a larger and larger per-capita share of the national income, while those engaged in agriculture have had a smaller per-capita share. Exactly the same disparity exists between the countries which export mainly agricultural and other raw products, and those which have a high level of industrial technique. The United States, which has the highest technical level of all, has come out on top of the heap, comparatively speaking; the sign of the uneven terms of trade is the one-way flow of the world's gold into the ground of Kentucky.

What is the reason? Briefly, it is that while people want more and more of industrial products, as far as they have any money with which to buy them, there is a limit to their wants for staple food products like wheat. Even the demand for higher grades of food is less "elastic," as the economists say, than the demand for products of industry. Yet technical improvements increase productivity in agriculture as they do in industry, and it is much harder to limit agricultural output than industrial, when demand slackens. Therefore, agricultural prices have a long-term tendency to fall, in relation to industrial. Depression aggravates this situation, but does not cause it.

What is the remedy? During depression we tried governmental restriction of agricultural production, and so did other nations, but that is not satisfactory. Our present experience indicates a better answer. It is expansion of industrial production, which at once increases the market for primary products and draws surplus population from the farms into industrial employment.

That works fairly well within a single nation, but farmers cannot easily move from Argentina to Detroit. The principle, however, is the same. If investment capital from the United States is sent to Argentina, that helps to rectify the balance of payments while it is going out, and so stabilizes the exchange market. And if in Argentina it is used to expand industrial production, it supplies employment for surplus rural population, and makes it possible in the end for Argentinians to buy at home more of the manufactured products they want.

Thus, when exchange difficulties were found to persist and there was a danger of currency devaluation or other practices that act as trade barriers, the international bank would, while giving temporary relief, do two things: (a) encourage expansion of industrial production in the countries already industrialized, and (b) encourage more foreign investment for industrial expansion in the less developed countries.

All this is a much abbreviated hint of the possible functions of international economic organization. Fundamentally, it rests on a very simple truth which everybody can understand. If people are to have more, they must produce more. With economic expansion, every problem is capable of solution; without it, we have major depressions and wars. The first duty of those who build the peace is to make sure that expansion occurs. It can occur if we coöperate for the good of all; it cannot occur if we squabble over the division of a deficit.

GEORGE SOULE

This is the final article in the series, "Peacemaking Has Begun." —THE EDITORS

Historic Landscape

Upon our heels events like giants tread,
Making great out-size shadows on the plain;
Like giants trample into mud the yellowed grain,
And sow new fields of harvest for the dead.
In valleys where we walk the giants tread
Soft in the river muck yet shake the ground,
And in the air at evening without sound
They move the wings of death above our head.

But when we stand upon tomorrow's height
With plain and valley mapped before our eyes,
Fields will be growing green again; there flies
Down that still air no wing save bird or light.
And we shall see upon the sunlit land
These giants shrunken smaller than our hand.

ELEANOR WELLS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Race Fear Sweeps the South

Third in the Series, "Trouble in Dixie"

RACE RELATIONS between the whites and the Negroes in America are our most fertile soil for Axis propaganda, and it is obvious that the Germans and the Japanese have not overlooked this field. But it seems to me far from certain that fifth-columnists had anything to do with the dangerous race-riot rumors which swept through Memphis on October 6—or whether the hand of the Axis can be detected unmistakably in any of the other sensational incidents or in the talk of impending race trouble which today dominates the imaginations of Southern white people. This talk of knives and arsenals and blackout massacres is the talk of fever dreams. An old malaise of race fear settles sometimes upon the Southern spirit. For long decades it lies dormant, like malaria, to return with violence in the wake of wars and great upheavals.

The reason this happens in the South is not mysterious. For it is here that the great masses of Negroes live side by side with whites. Mankind is still moved by all the fears and suspicions of the tribe instinct—and no two skins are farther apart in color than the white man's and the Negro's. The whole culture of the South has been built upon these conditions. And a war does weird things to such a culture. It seems to me that two things are true: first, the fantastic rumors of race trouble can, and have in the past, sprout spontaneously in such a background; second, that the Axis agents in this country, whatever their number, would certainly have tried to invade this field. Whatever its original source or combination of sources, the current race tension in the South is a growing threat. It is a military threat. It is, furthermore, a condition drifting out of control. It is time for the proper government services to acknowledge the situation and initiate a broad and open effort to allay it. The government should begin now a campaign to puncture these dangerous rumors, expose their sources and lead the whole field of race relations out of the swamps of nameless fear back onto solid ground.

Efforts toward these ends are now being made by individual editors, writers and organizations, white and black, and these groups are locked in a hopeless tangle of conflicting views. Writings on this subject, including this series, have passed from the remedial stage into the bitterly controversial. The unpublicized efforts which government agencies have made thus far to approach this problem through Southern white and Negro leaders have been far from sufficient. So far as I could see on a recent trip through the South, these efforts got lost somewhere along the line. They have not yet reached the rumor-mongering man in the street or the housewife sitting around the afternoon sewing table. A vastly greater effort is needed. Here in this racial tension exists the threat of a domestic Pearl Harbor that many see coming. Doubtless it will not arrive until the white and Negro soldiers come back from the war. But the way to prevent it is to prevent it, not temporize until the hour has struck, and express thanksgiving on the first anniversary that it wasn't worse.

The race-riot threat at Memphis which was discussed in the January 4 issue of The New Republic, was a result of which any Axis agent might have felt proud. I believe that it could have developed spontaneously in the excited imaginations of the white people of Memphis. This at least is the public attitude expressed by the Memphis police commissioner, and implied in a statement of the local FBI. I have been told some wild and dangerous lies about Negroes by white friends in the South who, on any other subject, are responsible and upright people. In Mississippi I was told that the Negroes had bought up the high-powered ammunition in all the sports stores and that "every nigger in town has bought a good gun." In Louisiana an old friend said that all the high-powered ammunition had been bought up by white men. These statements should not be taken too literally. There is a curious air of half-belief and half tall-talk with which Southern white people repeat stories about race trouble. But now a combination of circumstances—the excitement of war, the Negro's new economic independence and the scheming of politicians—have worked together to excite this element in the Southern character. In Memphis, on the occasion of the race-riot rumors in August and October, this emotional pitch reached the point of hysteria.

"These rumors have come to our attention," said the Memphis FBI agent, Percy Wyly, "and we have checked them, with the thought that they have been inspired by foreign agitators, but to date there has been no indication of any foreign agitation among Negroes in this area." (No mention of the possibility of Axis scare propaganda among the whites.)

That was the agent's official statement to the press and, in the manner of the FBI, he would not go into detail. But the agency has been investigating the causes of disturbed race relations throughout the South, and I believe it would disarm some of the dangerous rumor-mongers in the South if the Office of War Information would prepare an adequate public announcement on this subject using specific incidents in the FBI files. Undoubtedly the FBI has records of Axis agitation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among Negroes, and has brought about arrests in Harlem, Chicago and other places. But in the South, where some three-fourths of America's 13,000,000 Negroes live, it is extremely doubtful whether FBI records would reveal any instances at all of pro-Axis plotting. I believe it can and should be shown that white bigots and rumor-mongers and brutal demagogues are doing the South—the South which they possess and others love—the tragic disservice they have always done it.

I believe, however, it is also true that many Negroes, North and South, blinded by bitterness, have a confused feeling that the Japanese are at war with the *white* people. This is the Japanese propaganda line; but even this attitude could have developed among many Negroes spontaneously. Most of those who feel this are not willful traitors: only completely disillusioned, cynical, hopeless Negroes. It is not that they are moved by an active interest in a Japanese victory, but that a cold bitterness has taken up its abode within them, and chokes their hearts, and their hearts no longer can respond when the white man speaks of fighting a war across the world for four freedoms and democracy. The white man must hold himself largely responsible for this; but the thing is nevertheless intolerable and it must be fought. Fighting it is a dual responsibility. It rests partly on white leaders, who must start right now—and no timid and hypocritical double talk about it—to prepare the way for major social reforms in the Negro's behalf; and it rests partly on the Negro's leaders, who have got to bring a burning realization to their own people that the Negro's victory at home depends totally, utterly, completely on America's victory, *the Negro's victory*, in the war against the Japanese and the Germans. There is no room for cheap sneering on these issues—either by William P. Witherow of the NAM or by any faint-hearted or cynical Negro leader. The issues are clear. The white man who clings to white racism might ask an Englishman what his arrogant whiteness got him in Burma and Hong Kong: treachery by natives and a Japanese bayonet in the belly. And the Negro who clings to his colored racism while rebelling against the white man's, might invoke the spirit of some raped and butchered yellow Chinese woman of Nanking to ask what mercy her color won for her, and whether the Japanese are at war with the *white* people.

I want to discuss in greater detail these generalizations about both the white and Negro psychology, as it can be observed in the South today, but now I will continue with emphasis for the time being on the white man's attitude.

In Memphis Joe Boyle, commissioner of public safety, told me that a race-riot scare which swept through the city in connection with the first test blackout last August "got started among a group of white people out at one of the best country clubs, people who had nothing to do but sit around and talk." Joe Boyle, a friendly, white-haired politician, went over the situation with me in a rambling conversation. Occasionally some Negroes got out of line, he said, but the average Negro still knew his place, and he still knew the white man was his friend so long as he kept to that place. It wasn't only the Negroes who were stirred up, he said; everybody was. He thought that Memphis newspapers which had jumped him some months earlier for buying new guns and equipment must feel satisfied now that he did so. The new material consisted of "twenty machine guns, forty shotguns, tear gas and ammunition." To a question he said no, it was not so much the Negroes he was worrying about when he bought the equipment; it was everything. Labor agitators. Communists. Everything. The whole world was turned upside down.

Joe Boyle's boss is E. H. Crump, sixty-seven, a tall, friendly, white-haired politician. He has held Memphis' politics in the palm of his hand since 1909, although he now has no official position. He has voted Negroes, whenever he needed them, for some thirty years. (This is a political phenomenon unique in the South, but not significant.) The Negro used to vote for whiskey and watermelon. In the last presidential election Boss Crump found that the Memphis Negroes had grown up. They were listening to their own leaders, and their leaders wanted to go back into the Republican Party. Joe Boyle's police ran the leaders, three of them, out of town. One had a restaurant, one a drug store. Police stood at the entrances and searched customers for "weapons and dope." The shops closed and the Negroes left town.

This has left a standing resentment among Memphis Negroes and contributed to their maturing race awareness and to their expressed desire for better treatment. When they crowd in the back of Memphis' Jim Crow streetcars, going to and from their work for white employers, they are more apt these days to make some sullen, muttered answer when jostled by a white man. A Memphis laundry put up a huge mechanical sign of a Negro mammy at a wash-tub, her ample rear facing toward the public. The Negroes didn't like this. They have a growing sense of dignity, and ridicule their own Uncle Tom and Aunt Dinah types—their own phrase—who play up to the white man's conception of the Negro as a clown. A prominent Negro business man did not remove his hat in the public waiting room of the United States Employment Services. When told to do so in an insulting manner, he turned and walked out. He telephoned the office to complain, returned, stated his case, and left again. Two white policemen arrested him, beat him and kicked him, made him stamp on the disputed hat, brought him to city court, where he was fined $10. The Negroes didn't like this either. The fine was later returned, with soothing words by a city official that "we have extremists in both races." The Negroes still didn't like it. Their local paper said so.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And undoubtedly, as has happened throughout the South, incidents like this have made many of them sullen and bitter. It is reflected in their eyes and their faces and their speech when they talk to white people. And many of them are quitting their menial jobs with white employers to take better-paying jobs in defense industries. Many a Negro mother with two or three sons in the service is drawing $50 or $75 a month from the government. And many of these are quitting white housewives, who assumed all along that their servants were perfectly happy in their work, at $5 a week.

There is no reason for singling out Memphis except that the race restlessness there has been sharply outlined by a riot scare. Developments like this are taking place all over the South. They add up to something mysterious and frightening to the majority of white Southerners. They accept rumors of Negro rebelliousness without question, and exaggerate them in the telling. It is not hard to understand how stories of ammunition and knives, race riots and "Eleanor clubs" go the rounds, once they are started. But one thing I should like to ask the FBI is, who starts them? This whole subject should be aired in Washington. It has not been, I suppose, for fear of offending Southern officials and of adding to the breach which already exists between the Southern politicians and the New Deal. But the question still stands: who starts these rumors? It is easy enough to see how an excited white Southerner would be eager to pass them on. But these stories are definite, dynamic lies. They give place-names, dates and times for Negro uprisings. They have created a whole mythology about the doings of Eleanor clubs. Who makes them up? Do they spring to being in the minds of New Deal-hating Southerners, or do they constitute a propaganda line tailor-made in Berlin for the Southern states? In any event, their results would be the same. And I suppose any group of people eager to tell a lie could also furnish the lie.

A group of Negro leaders from ten Southern states, meeting in Atlanta on December 14, in order to form an opposition to the wild rumors lest they destroy every legitimate effort of the Negro to press for his long-standing goals, recommended the organization of Negro domestics into unions with recognized affiliations. "It seems desirable to emphasize," they said, "that this proposal bears no relation to the fantastic and probably Axis-inspired rumors of so-called Eleanor clubs." At her press conference on September 1, Mrs. Roosevelt said that government investigation of the mythical Eleanor clubs (which in rumor she was supposed to have been organizing among Negro servants to agitate against white Southern housewives) had proved that these organizations existed only in the imaginations of the rumor-mongers. Mrs. Roosevelt said she supposed the rumors started as a result of so many Negro women obtaining higher wages in war factories, thus leaving their employers without servants. It would be interesting to know, and perhaps eventually the OWI will tell, who started the Eleanor-club stories, and where they were started, Memphis, Jackson, New Orleans, Birmingham, Atlanta, or Berlin.

No Negro I talked to in the South knew of the existence of an Eleanor club. A Negro servant in New Orleans I have known for years could not even understand what I was talking about. But I have heard from white people a hundred of these snide and merciless Eleanor stories on visits to the South during the past year and a half. Mrs. Roosevelt is the most hated symbol the middle-class white South has had since Harriet Beecher Stowe. Honorable men and women, who in their personal lives are true to the rules of decency and character, spread slanderous jokes and lies about her with icy malice. There are enough Eleanor jokes going the rounds, funny jokes, expert jokes, to fill a book. They are personal insults to Mrs. Roosevelt and her family. Whenever Westbrook Pegler comes up with the specialty he finds new friends in the South. Landlords talk of letters which Mrs. Roosevelt has written to Negro tenants telling them "to pay whatever they think the house is worth" and "of course Negroes are as good as white people"; but the letters are not produced. Housewives tell one another of former Negro yardboys who are making fantastic salaries on war jobs. There are a number of stories that may be heard in any city in the South, usually told by some prosperous housewife, and usually alleged to have happened to one of her friends. A typical story is about the white woman who calls a former servant to ask if she knows where a good maid might be found, and gets an answer like "No, I sure doesn't, I'se looking for a good maid myself." Another story has it that the Eleanor clubs have the motto "a white woman in the kitchen by Christmas." Another story which has recently gained currency describes mythical "Disappointment clubs," branches of the Eleanor clubs whose members have the special task of disappointing white housewives by not showing up for work when they are most needed.

In conversation among prosperous white people, even on the steps of fashionable churches after the sermon is over, one hears a most callous and un-Christlike kind of talk. Much of it concerns the difficulty of finding Negro maids. "We will never be able to get good maids again until the government stops paying their husbands those ridiculous salaries." The hearts of the kindest and gentlest of Southern women seem steeled against the Negro and anything affecting his well being. In rare instances one will hear a still, small voice speak up like the voice of conscience, "Well I think the Negroes ought to get more money; they certainly don't have a thing in the world now." But a chorus of resentment drowns out such a remark, and someone is bound to add, like a line in a stage play, "*You* must belong to an Eleanor club, my dear."

THOMAS SANCTON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Opening Gun

MISS STANLEY OF NEW YORK, who didn't wear any ribbons, said some very cutting things to lady reporters about Mrs. Luce of Connecticut, who did. Mr. Martin, the Republican leader, told a Chicago Tribune reporter that he would insist upon congressional investigation of the rumor that Mrs. Harry Hopkins got a wedding present of emeralds from Lord Beaverbrook. Lord Beaverbrook said the rumor was unfounded. Mrs. Hopkins said it was all a lie. Mr. Cox of Georgia told a New York Daily News reporter that those so-and-so's, meaning the New Dealers, were about to get what was coming to them.

Republicans and Old Deal Democrats had themselves well enough in hand by the second day to refrain from hissing the President when he appeared in person to deliver his state-of-the-nation-address. It was a triumph of restraint.

Mr. Dies of Texas immediately started campaigning for a new appropriation by promising to expose sinister forces in the last campaign against sitting congressmen. Mr. Hoffman of Michigan promised that he would presently expose the Justice Department's sedition case against some thirty alleged pro-Axis conspirators. Investigations of lease-lend, war production and whatnot sprouted on every hand. The isolationists went to work packing committees.

Congressional leaders served notice on the President that they could not answer for the consequences if he went through with his reported plan to demand extension of the social-security system. Speaker Rayburn went further: he held a press conference to put out the story that certain House leaders, who would have to remain anonymous, were profoundly disturbed by the President's position on social security. Mr. McCormack of Massachusetts, the Democratic floor leader, meanwhile urged the White House to welcome Joe Kennedy, former isolationist Ambassador to Great Britain, back into the administration fold. And Democratic Senators chastised Mr. Barkley, their leader, at a caucus for his failure to "stand up to the President" on legislative questions.

Senator Thomas, the Oklahoma inflationist, perfected an organization of farm lobbies which, he said, would assure a united front agriculture in this session, and announced agriculture's demands, which, if met, would send the price of living through the already strained control ceilings. The farmers' demands were accompanied by threats to repeal the forty-hour week and thus deprive labor of overtime pay.

Into this mess the President eased his message. It was deliberately inoffensive. The White House is proceeding on the theory that this Congress can't be as bad as it looks —that once it has blown off the initial head of steam, it will operate smoothly enough to turn out routine appropriation bills and other essential war measures. And so it doubtless will. The question is how much energy it will then devote to disruption of home-front arrangements. The farm bloc, assuming that its grunt turns out to be several times as bad as its bite, can still throw the national economy dis-astrously off balance. Even the lease-lend and reciprocal-trade policies cannot be regarded as secure.

Everything it did in the first days of the session betrayed an ugly and reckless disposition. Republicans refused to pat a hand the opening day when Rayburn, winding up a speech in which he had asserted the independence of Congress and taken a few snide cracks at the New Deal, spoke a kindly word for the Commander-in-Chief. The President himself was roundly applauded when he reviewed the accomplishments of the United Nations and the United States as warmakers. But his references to peace plans at home and abroad, circumspect as they were, could have been pearls dropped in a pig wallow for all the responsive splash they evoked.

The essential characteristics of the new Congress already are manifest and they are not pleasant to contemplate. The New Deal's emotional opposition has a firm majority in both branches, made up of conservative Republicans and reactionary Democrats. The loyalty of this opposition, measured by determination to see the war through to a successful conclusion, cannot be questioned even though a few members of its lunatic fringe should have been indicted for seditious conspiracy along with their non-congressional collaborators. Responsible leaders of the opposition are committed to support of some kind of association of nations to make and keep the peace after this war. Speaking for the Republicans, Harrison Spangler, the new GOP chairman, timed with the opening of Congress a statement formally dissociating the party from isolationism.

However, the Republican commitment on this question is no firmer now than it was in 1920, when the Republicans were preparing to knife the League. And there remains in both the House and Senate a small, determined nucleus of what can become another camarilla. The Wheeler-Johnson-Nye crowd in the Senate is far from beaten.

As for domestic policy, the outlook is worse. The progressive group has been reduced to a very small minority which lacks strong leadership. These liberals will have their hands full defending the forty-hour week, lease-lend, price control and other essential administration birds in hand for some time to come. They can expect some support from moderates in both parties. But unless they get strong and organized support from the outside, particularly from labor, the New Deal will lose important ground at home. Their fight to hold down the cost of living may bring them enough prestige to push Senator Wagner's measure extending social security later on.

The opposition tactic is simple—perhaps too simple. It was made clear the day Congress opened in a statement by Martin: assume that the country feels toward Roosevelt now as it did toward Hoover in 1932 and for the similar reason that economic dislocations have made it uncomfortable; play on this assumption by blaming everything on "arrogant bureaucrats"; and keep the record straight on war issues. The weakness in this is that it doesn't take into account the majority of voters who stayed away from the polls last November. Even if this Congress is the product of anti-New Deal sentiment, and that alone, it remains the expression of a minority revolt. If the Dies-Cox-Hoffman fringe continues to front for this revolution, the counter-revolution may not be long in coming. Therein lies hope.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Town

NOWHERE is movie censorship and the effect of a box-office control on art so apparent as in the second half of a double bill, where one might expect to find the movies' practice fields and proving grounds—new talent, unconventional stories and ways of showing them. Instead one finds a macabre and grotesque thing like "The Great Gildersleeve." This is a typical "B"—about an American family, the Gildersleeves, in the American town, Summerfield—made for the suburbs and the towns; so that the theatres there can coax their public with two pictures for the price of one. It merits discussion because it is typical.

Since we find that the B picture is not experimental, we might then expect, because censorship and box-office decree that no one's feelings be either examined or hurt, that it at least be a fairly innocuous picture of an average American family. However, this is not it either; for up pops so gross a misrepresentation of American life that it might almost be a revulsion on the part of the producer at the kind of people and culture which made for the forces that made this picture. These "average" Americans in "The Great Gildersleeve" are all of the idiot variety, and the sole concern of each is to outtrick the rest by deceit, lie or practical joke.

The Great Gildersleeve is a huge, glutinous, moronic fellow, who moves about without aim, purpose or profession, yet rides in a fine car, to a fine home, in which there are two adopted children, a maid and a grand piano; his radio trademark seems to be an ability to get into trouble and when there to give an unconvincing laugh. His daughter leads around a five-piece orchestra of collegiate adolescents, who carry their trumpets and saxophones uncased; so that they can break into music at any place or moment, whereupon the daughter becomes a high-stepping drum majorette. The county judge is a disreputable version of the man with the pitchfork in Grant Wood's "American Gothic." His one concern is to marry off his homely sister and turn her room into a den for himself. The rest of the citizenry tag along after the judge or Gildersleeve to see which one will best the other.

The judge threatens to take Gildersleeve's children away from him unless he marries the judge's daughter. The children figure out the solution: they will make Gildersleeve more famous than even the judge, by covering the town with pictures of his face and titled only—The Great Gildersleeve. The idea being that fame and position depend—as the children explain—not on "What you do, but on what people think you did."

Just as repellent is the picture projected of the American scene: the county court in session with only two people present, the recorder playing solitaire and the judge kibitzing; the great banquet where the town's important citizens play their pranks on the guest speaker (the microphone squirts water in his face, there is a hidden buzzer in his chair); the footrace between Gildersleeve and the judge to decide which is the better man; and finally, those two vicious gossips, who get into all American-town-life movies as the trademark.

In everything, then, is ruthless disrespect for ourselves and our lives. It bears no resemblance to the French satires on European provincial life ("The Baker's Wife," "Carnival in Flanders"), nor to Alfred Hitchcock's great displays of humor in his secondary characters. In these the criticism starts from essential love and respect for the people, and even more, from knowledge. The French movies take pride in their people, in their sexual potency and freedom, in the cleverness and bravery of the women, in their good looks, in the artistry of the craftsmen, in the pleasure instinct of the Jouvets, the independence of the Gabins. When the French movies poke fun it is at the mishaps caused by a too eager enjoyment of life. "The Great Gildersleeve" is absolutely without standards, its humor exterior to life.

I think "The Great Gildersleeve" is less the fault of Hollywood's workers than it is of censorship, box-office and a lack of indignation from the movie public. The movie code decrees that the showing of actual love is indecent; in "The Great Gildersleeve" love becomes a matter of juggling for prestige, of how one person can trick the other into marrying. Pressure groups and box-office insist that actual American life not be examined closely; Americans' activities in this movie consist entirely of childish pranks and conceits. Honest failure is considered shocking; instead success is shown, even if it is only a matter of advertising that fools the public. But also it is felt that real intellectual success is un-American, and so all leaders in the community are made plain, down-to-earth idiots. Finally, it is inacceptable for the characters in the movie to react with real emotion; the substitute for this warmth and human feeling is the defeat of the other person, roses round the door and money.

In B pictures the worst elements in Hollywood production run wild. There is neither time nor inclination in the production of B pictures for the invention and hard work that in A pictures overcome the codes and prejudices. Obviously there are too many pictures; there should be no B's at all, unless they are used as experimental cinema, where the errors of inexperience, new and untried attitudes could be made and learned from. Perhaps the most deadly thing about "The Great Gildersleeve" is that it has no errors.

MANNY FARBER

The Bandwagon

FINLAND REASSURES
U. S. ON KEEPING PEACE
Country Has Enough Enemies
Now, Premier Says
—*Head and subhead in The New York Times.*

[Julian] Huxley is the unofficial spokesman and philosopher of a large section of the educational world under whom many of our young people study. There is a direct connection between his way of thinking—the all-truth-is-relative, there-are-no-eternal-certitudes school of thinking—and the fact that two Bronx teachers have been bitten by pupils. —*From a letter to The New York Post.*

20-Minute Midwest Test
Held Success; Assistant
Warden Killed
—*Subhead on a blackout story in The Syracuse Herald Journal.*

Garbo has decided she will not play in the picture, "Rus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sia," and is still looking for an important story. – *Sidney Skolsky in The New York Post.*

And Massaging Nazis

War makes little difference to hardship-conditioned Russians, who have probably developed special muscles from standing in queues. – *Alice Leone Moats in Collier's.*

Ever Heard of Him?

Coincidentally, an announcement by Sir Andrew Browne Cunningham, Allied naval commander, revealed that an agreement had been made by which French merchant ships in North and West Africa would be employed, "some directly in the Allied cause to defeat [Reichsführer] Hitler. . . ." – *From The New York Times.*

Total-War Department

Liberal Lord Rosebery, Regional Commissioner for Scotland, announced that some 17,000,000 gallons of aging Scotch whiskey have now been buried in "abandoned caves and other remote and inaccessible places." Lord Rosebery, who has a tasteful appreciation for good art, good horses and good whiskey, ruefully added: "A single enemy plane . . . with no idea of specific target, dropped a single bomb which fell plumb on . . . 70,000 gallons. That shows what we're up against." – *From Time magazine.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

What Should We Do with Germany?

SIR: In his review "But Listen, Dorothy," Malcolm Cowley speaks of "two American schools of thought with regard to Germany." The first considers the Germans as absolutely incorrigible: therefore we must see to it that they are made permanently harmless. The second holds that any lasting peace will have to be fair to the Germans of the next generation.

For the last twenty-five years—indeed for the last forty years —I have unequivocally belonged to the second school, the one which, against repeated disappointments, kept advocating justice, coöperation, reconciliation.

But, for that very reason, I want to take issue with Mr. Cowley's assertion that "the impulse toward national unity has been the strongest and in a way the healthiest element in modern German history." German culture attained its peak with Kant, Beethoven and Goethe, world-citizens who thought and felt in supra-national terms. Culture and national organization are not necessarily linked. "National unity" is one of those nineteenth-century aspirations which have proved deceptive and fraught with catastrophes. The desire for German unity, praised by Mr. Cowley, leads straight through Bismarck to Hitler. Totalitarianism is but integral nationalism. The sole aim of political unity is to achieve power in order to enforce the collective (united) will upon dissenters, alien minorities, weaker neighbors. It implies a ruthless, all-embracing *Gleichschaltung*, until all Germans have but one thought and one will, that of the Führer.

I am not thinking in terms of Germany alone. A federal Italy would be more lovable and spiritually richer than the unitary ideal which, through Cavour, found its logical end in Mussolini. A federal Iberia, in which Catalonia and the Basque Provinces would have their autonomous existence by the side of Castile, Aragon or Portugal, would be happier than the "united" Spain of General Franco. If you make "national unity" the goal of Yugoslavia, Czecho-Slovakia or Rumania, you will pave the way for eternal tyranny punctuated but not mitigated by assassination.

The salvation of Europe will come from a complete divorce between the territorial *State*, which exists for purely administrative purposes, and the national *Culture*, which ignores material boundaries, and has little to do with the antics of politicians. The Germany of the spirit is one, manifold, and worldwide; just as the France of the spirit embraces Rousseau, Joseph de Maistre, Verhaeren, Maeterlinck, Jean Moreas and Julian Green.

There is no future for nineteenth-century nationalism in Europe except incessant war. What we need is first of all a United Europe, for Europe is historically, economically and spiritually one. Within that general framework, we must have as many autonomous regions or *States*, in the American sense of the term, as may be needed for effective administration. Finally, quite apart from political boundaries, we must assure the free development of all traditional cultures. Within United Europe, a man must obey the local traffic regulations and pay the local taxes. But if he is at heart a German, a German he must be free to remain, in Prague or in Riga, in Transsylvania or in Switzerland, in Paris or in London. And what is true of the German is true of the Magyar, the Czech or the Pole. Hitler speaks of Germany, divided, helpless, "becoming for a long time nothing better than a seed of civilization fertilizing the outside world." It will be a happy day, for Germany and for the world, when the conditions he deplores are restored.

New York City ALBERT GUÉRARD

[A federalized Germany in a federalized Europe would be a highly desirable solution. My protest was against the very different idea of annexing German territory to the neighboring countries. – M. C.]

Brooks, Zabel and McFee

SIR: Permit me to say that I think The New Republic clearly owes an apology to William McFee. On three occasions last year you opened your columns to insulting and wholly gratuitous remarks about him, and Mr. Morton Zabel passes all bounds [The New Republic, January 4]. This gentleman not only refers to Mr. McFee as a "blurb-writer" but speaks of his novels as "hired" misrepresentations of Conrad. He even suggests that Conrad "resented," or would have resented, Mr. McFee as one of the "inferior . . . mass of readers and critics," whereas, in point of fact, as everyone knows, Conrad respected him highly and frequently said so.

This writer, for one, is not amused by scurrilous and impudent attacks on a writer of dignity and standing, and I am surprised that you have sponsored this petty persecution of the author of "The Harbormaster" and "Casuals of the Sea." I resent it as Conrad did *not* resent the writings of a man who has done so much to further his reputation.

I am sure that many of your readers share my feeling, and I hope that others will so express themselves. Meanwhile, in this controversy—if it can be so described—the cards have all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been stacked against Mr. McFee. Therefore it seems to me only fair and fitting that his defenders should have the last word.

Westport, Conn. VAN WYCK BROOKS

Radio Razzberry, Cont'd.

SIR: As maddening as many radio commercials are, it seems to me a much graver charge ought to be leveled against the entire business: its daytime "soap operas" addressed to housewives.

During vacation periods I have listened to some of these and make the following accusations: (1) they are on a moronic level; (2) they deal in bathos and encourage self-pity; (3) they are a first aid to neuroses; (4) they indict the entire feminine group as being exclusively non-intellectual and completely sentimental; (5) they present "men" as doing nothing except hanging around obsessed women.

Perhaps nothing can be done about these programs, since apparently they result in adequate business. One melancholy thought is that perhaps housewives are exactly what these programs imply: non-intellectual, moronic, sentimental, unhappy, animalistic. The announcers, with their lush intonations, sound for all the world like male madames or eunuchs.

Some sponsor might try the experiment of putting on a daytime show that will be equivalent to an evening program.

Utica, N.Y. LOUIS SALBITANO

Author's Corrections

SIR: I should like to correct two small errors in my article "Giraud and the Future of France" (The New Republic of January 11).

Owing to a slip in typing, I called Governor-General Yves Chatel of Algeria General Chatel. He is of course not a military but a civil officer.

I also said that only one general, Béthouard, of Morocco, responded to General Giraud's radio appeal to join the Allies. I have since learned that there was a second, General Maste, of Algiers.

New York City VARIAN FRY

The Will to Progress

SIR: It was not a mechanistic "pendulum" theory of history that Professor Schlesinger dealt with in The Yale Review, as Representative Eliot reported in your issue of November 16, but rather a "stairway" concept of social change. It was simply a figure of speech to illustrate the theory that every period of rapid social change is necessarily followed by a period in which these changes are digested (or nullified). This action gives rise to speculations about inevitable "pendulum" swings, but Dr. Schlesinger emphasized that it is by no means an automatic mechanism, and that in his view at least the period of adjustment or digestion is not a return to the *status quo ante*.

Whether you call it a "stairway" or a class struggle or a "pendulum," the story speaks for itself. Popular hopes and dreams in this country funneled successively into revolt against the Crown; removal of entail, primogeniture and property qualifications for voting (the poll tax was once a mark of progress); free thinking; free schools; free homesteads; white-manhood suffrage; emancipation of slaves; trade unionism; public regulation of utilities; conservation of the public domain; sex equality; income taxation; regulation of corporate enterprise; industrial unionism; social security; and public works. Nevertheless, Tom Paine was followed by Hamilton; Jefferson by Nick Biddle; Jackson by Calhoun; Lincoln by Collis Huntington; Cleveland by Morgan and Rockefeller; La Follette by Ford and duPont. It now looks as if the ascendency of the New Deal will be followed by an increase of influence by the National Association of Manufacturers and the American Newspaper Publishers' Association. Does this mean a complete return to tyranny and darkness? It does not even mean a return to irresponsible unemployment, mass poverty or laissez-faire. Tyranny and darkness have always been with us, and, in new forms, they will stay with us. But so will the constant striving of the human spirit for the light. Even a Republican isolationist may have a decent impulse.

Washington, D. C. MARCUS ROSENBLUM

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Alfred Baker Lewis of New York City writes to suggest concrete methods for breaking down racial tension in the South which was described in the first of a series of articles by Thomas Sancton in the January 4 issue. "The International Commission," says Mr. Lewis, "has done some useful work in the past," but he asks, "Is it now in retreat or inactive because Mr. Will Alexander, who was for many years its spark plug, is in government service, or for some other reason?

"Some at least of the ministers on both sides of the color line have been educated in Northern seminaries, or in other ways have developed ideas more compatible with democracy in interracial relations than the usual psychology of the white South, so that an extension of this sort of work should be helpful. In a few localities the unions affiliated with the CIO, the United Mine Workers and such AFL unions as the International Longshoremen's Association, which has equal rights for white and Negro members, are functioning in a proper spirit and direction. In its restricted field the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union likewise represents a hopeful development. Young people in the colleges are usually exposed to ideas different from the Southern pattern of race relations through the Student Christian Movement or the smaller but more extreme Fellowship of Southern Churchmen. Is it possible to vitalize such organizations and institutions more effectively?"

B. G. Braver-Mann of New York City writes to take issue with Manny Farber's article, "The Movie Art," in the October 26 issue. "Farber," writes Mr. Braver-Mann "cites the camera images of Tisse in Eisenstein's 'Alexander Nevsky' to illustrate what he chooses to say in these words: 'In the peculiar quality of each image, and in the movement created by their succession, exists the particular expression of the artist.' The selection of this film for reference is an unhappy one, for anybody who has had the experience of seeing this picture knows that it is episodic in the worst sense of the term and therefore poorly mounted, in spite of Eisenstein's possibly erudite, partly valid and considerably formalistic analysis of it in his book, 'The Film Sense.'

"What Mr. Farber has yet to learn is that the visual qualities of film images 'in succession,' however well recorded or composed, do not make a film work distinctive. Nor do they, as in 'Alexander Nevsky,' add anything pertinent to stilted, inhibited direction."

Writing "as an Englishman who knows America intimately," Eric Underwood of San Francisco says that "Americans have derived their knowledge of the Indian problem largely from tainted sources. They do not—quite naturally—appreciate the complexity of the problem nor the immense efforts made by the British for long years past to solve it."

The Highlander Folk School at Monteagle, Tennessee, will conduct a seminar for young men and women in the field of labor problems and methodology beginning February 1 and running through April. According to the announcement, capable teachers will have the opportunity of doing field work under the supervision of staff teachers in important union centers of the South.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

The Imp of the Perverse

LET US IMAGINE that Salvador Dali's autobiography was the subject of a lecture delivered in the year 2043 by a pedantic but not entirely humorless professor. "Good morning," he would say to his students while thumbing over his notes and wondering whether he could speak frankly without being reported to the Dean. At least he could begin with a safe generality. "The collapse of western Europe in the face of Hitler's armies was not merely a military disaster. We historians are convinced that it was partly caused by a profound moral and cultural decay, of which we seek the surviving evidence. We find it in a book now a hundred years old, 'The Secret Life of Salvador Dali.'[1] If Dali had never existed, we should have been forced to write the book ourselves.

"Instead of being a figment of our minds, he was born in the Catalonian town of Figueras, where his father was a prosperous notary. The date was 1904," the professor adds, seeing that his students have begun taking notes. "He was a badly spoiled child, and many of his whims were abnormal or even homicidal. Once he pushed a smaller playmate off an unfinished bridge, nearly killing him but feeling no remorse; instead young Salvador was happy and excited. He despised all other children, but he wanted to be admired by them, at any cost to himself. All his actions were guided by the imp of the perverse. 'I was against everything, systematically and on principle,' he tells us. 'It was only necessary for someone to say "black" to make me counter "white." It was only necessary for someone to bow with respect to make me spit. My continual and ferocious need to feel myself different made me weep with rage if some coincidence should bring me even fortuitously into the same category with others. Before all and at whatever cost: myself—myself alone! Myself alone! Myself alone!'"

The professor pauses for effect. "That complete self-absorption is not a healthy state, and it usually leads to other vices. That is what happened to Salvador Dali, if we can trust his own narrative. By the age of twenty, he was suffering from almost all the abnormalities listed by the nineteenth-century Viennese physicians—narcissism, masochism, sadism, fetishism, mother fixation, hypochondria, hysteria and something that he calls 'compulsive maniacal psychosis.' But he was also an extraordinarily brilliant painter, able to work—and willing to work hard—in half a dozen styles, from that of Velasquez to that of Picasso. And he had discovered a new subject matter—the forms and faces seen in his extraordinary dreams.

"Four years later, in 1928, he was already becoming famous and his pictures were selling, but the painter himself had begun to suffer from delusions, vertigo, suicidal impulses and fits of hysterical laughter that lasted for hours. He tells us that he was 'trying by every possible means to go mad—or rather,' he explains, 'doing everything in my conscious power to welcome and help that madness which I felt clearly intended to take up its abode in my soul.' That would have been its permanent home, if it had not been for the intervention of Gala Eluard, his future wife. The story of their love affair is ridiculous and tender and even a little terrifying; the only reason I shan't describe it at length is that it is hardly a proper subject for a professor of cultural history. But even a professor is allowed to say that Gala made him capable of facing life. She preserved his sanity by teaching him that his wildest dreams could be realized in the external world. Other paranoiacs—a term that Dali is fond of applying to himself—have been saved from insanity by learning the same lesson. Psychologists of the last century believed that Hitler was one of them.

"And Dali was, for a time, the dictator and tyrant of the art world. He writes—though of course we must allow for his boasting—'I saw Paris transformed before my eyes, in obedience to the order I had given at the moment of my arrival. . . . After a certain time,' he adds, 'I was able to perceive my imprint here and there merely in walking about the streets: laces, night clubs, shoes, films—hundreds of people were earning an honest living as a result of my influence.' Contemporary records partly support his statement. There is no doubt that French taste changed rapidly, and in what he would call a Dalinian direction, though of course we cannot decide as historians whether Dali was responsible for the change or whether it merely coincided with his arrival. We observe, however, that not only Paris but international society in general was eager to welcome this notary's son from Figueras. Like him, it worshiped the imp of the perverse, but Dali had made perversity a new religion. Like him, it had no fixed standards, but Dali at least had violent opinions which society began to accept. His dream pictures were admired not only because they were beautifully painted but also because they revealed something hidden and ugly in the minds of his audience.

"He was shrewd, too, with the shrewdness of a Catalonian burgher who knows the value of rank and money. He liked to insult aristocrats, but he also offered them crutches for their vanity, and in return they bought his pictures. The aristocrats trusted him because, in that era of political upheavals, he so clearly hated and despised the masses. There was never any danger of finding him on a different side of the barricades from the Comtesse Marie Blanche de Polignac or the Prince and Princesse de Faucigny-Lucinge, whom he admired for what he calls their 'indisputable sense of tone . . . the slightly gamey residue of the super-elegant and exotic pictures of Aubrey Beardsley.' He admired nothing that was natural and almost nothing that was strictly human.

"He invented a hundred devices for disguising the human body. Among them were artificial fingernails made of little reducing mirrors in which elegant ladies could admire themselves, slippers to be worn on the head, and gowns that had false supplementary breasts budding from the back. He also discovered a figurative method for proclaiming his

[1] The Secret Life of Salvador Dali, by Salvador Dali. Translated by Haakon M. Chevalier. New York: The Dial Press. 400 pages, illustrated. $6.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The best of all the peace books."

—MAX LERNER

The new book by

Michael Straight

MAKE THIS THE LAST WAR

The Future of the United Nations

MAX LERNER:
"Without exception, the best of all the peace books. If we can carry out its militancy and its wisdom, we can win the future."

PEARL BUCK:
"I have not read a book coming out of this war which has moved me so much as this one. . . . A practical chart for a world victory for the United Nations."

BRUCE BLIVEN:
"A remarkable achievement . . . Here we have for the first time a clear and comprehensive outline of the absolute minimum essentials for efficient prosecution of the war and for a just and lasting peace. This book can serve as a 'field manual of operations' of the highest value."

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN:
"An eloquent and moving book which is a major contribution toward winning the war and the peace. May it be widely read, and thought about, and *acted upon*."

ROGER BALDWIN:
"Well organized, documented, full of hard sense, and infused with democratic faith. . . . A challenge to action."

ROBERT VALEUR:
"It should open the eyes of all who fail to realize that we are not fighting an ordinary war but a rebellion against mankind."

$3.00 HARCOURT, BRACE & CO., 383 Madison Avenue, N. Y. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hatred of ordinary mankind. It was the use of bread, the symbol of human needs, as a purely esthetic object, the material for fantastic sculptures and Surrealist knicknacks. 'My bread,' he tells us, 'was a ferociously anti-humanitarian bread; it was the bread of the revenge of imaginative luxury on the utilitarianism of the rational, practical world.' And he adds that his obsession with bread 'had led to a revery'—I quote—'which became crystallized in the plan of founding a secret society of bread, which would have as its aim the systematic cretinization of the masses.'

"It would be Hitler and not Dali who really founded that secret society."

The professor pauses to consult his notes. "I don't mean to say that Dali was a rival or an ally of Hitler's. He regarded himself as completely unpolitical and even unhistorical—the latter being one of his favorite words, like 'intra-uterine' and 'paranoiac.' Yet he also insists that he had become 'the most representative incarnation of postwar Europe,' and 'unhistorical' is hardly the right word to describe that function. The truth is that in Dali's story and even more in his paintings—the book is abundantly illustrated—we can see how men's minds were prepared for the disasters to come. The spirit of perversity led to the negation of all existing standards. What was black today would become white tomorrow; what was ugly would become beautiful until, on the morrow, it was deserted for some newer and more striking ugliness. Rich people were so bored that they had to invent artificial irritations in order to remove them and thereby feel an artificial sense of relief.

"For a hundred years, one school of thought had succeeded another; now the imp of the perverse began to whisper that the only interesting prospect was a violent deed that would end all schools of thought. The prevailing anarchy gave birth to a desire for order—any sort of order, even if it was imposed by a conqueror and even if it was purely malign. Thus, the new war was not only a political event but also the answer to a profound psychological compulsion.

"When the Germans invaded France, Dali was furiously painting in a villa near Bordeaux. Seized like his audience by the desire for authority and order, he was trying to recapture the spirit of the Italian Renaissance. 'I fell back,' he says 'into that "all" that was the spirit of Leonardo. Cosmogony, cosmogony, cosmogony! The conquest of all, the systematic interpretation of all metaphysics, of all philosophy and of all science, according to the fund of Catholic tradition. . . . Compared with all this,' he exclaims, 'the European war appeared to me like an episodic children's fight on a street corner.'

"Then one day the Germans appeared." The professor stops to see whether his students have followed him, but most of them are looking out of the window; they are not much interested in a crazy world that was destroyed long years ago. "I want you to make a note of this," the professor says. "When the Germans swooped down on Bordeaux, they were, as Dali says, 'camouflaged in the Schiaparelli and Dali manner, wearing cynical and mimetic costumes with branches of leaves freshly torn from the soil of France bursting from their sandy animal hair.' In other words, the weird creatures of Dali's dreams had come alive and were overrunning the real earth."

MALCOLM COWLEY

Marxian Economics Today

The Theory of Capitalist Development, by Paul M. Sweezy. New York: The Oxford University Press. 398 pages. $4.

PAUL SWEEZY has been for several years one of the leading interpreters of Marxian economics in academic circles. While teaching courses in the economics of socialism he was justifiably distressed by the scarcity of literature in English on Marxian political economy. This lack, he felt, tended to foster a superficial understanding of what Marx really meant, and he resolved to offer a comprehensive analytic study of Marxism to fill the apparent gap in our knowledge of this difficult and abstruse branch of economic thought. There can be no question but that he has rendered valiant service in performing this task. His book, lucidly written and accomplished, covers the important essentials of the Marxian system. Beginning with a discussion of the theory of value, Sweezy carefully leads his reader through the mazelike "law of the falling tendency of the rate of profit" and the theory of capitalist accumulation. The treatment culminates in a fresh and rather original exposition of the Marxian version of crisis theory, monopoly and the structure of world economy.

Sweezy's scholarly perception is unquestioned: yet he makes no attempt to appraise the present-day validity of Marxism. He accepts virtually all its precepts simply because Marx insisted that economics must be a science of human relationships. In a limited sense this view is preferable to that of the orthodox economist, who is concerned primarily with the relation of man to the world of things about him. As a result, the kind of theory he develops and the kind of economic law he postulates relates only to the hypothetical behavior of a single individual in a world he has neither made nor feels able to control. And the view of reality we obtain from "bourgeois" economics is as though we were looking through the small end of a telescope. It has an inescapable microscopic quality; the crucial problems are those of atomic business units which passively react to economic activity rather than participate in it. Marx repudiated this type of analysis. Driven by an almost feverish, if unconscious, moral imperative, he sought the key to an understanding of men in their relationship to each other. His drive led him to the construction of a grand but rough body of theory which would enable one to grasp broad sweeps of reality. The crucial problems now seemed macroscopic; they encompassed whole systems of economy.

Yet both the orthodox economist and the Marxist are lacking here. Each emphasizes his own point of view to the exclusion of any other. The orthodox approach transformed economics into a sterile, mathematical parlor game. And we are at last beginning to grasp the significance of the extreme sociological approach of the Marxist; it repeatedly results in dogma. An economics that will be neither sterile nor dogmatic must grow out of the realization that man's habits and hopes are formed not only by his reactions to others but by his manipulation of the physical world as well.

Sweezy, of course, would not accept such criticism. For him an understanding of society, and therefore of economics, must be based only on the Marxian principle. Yet observe some of the awkwardness his logic enforces. In dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cussing the role of monopoly in modern economic society, for example, Sweezy can never quite make clear the influence of the *technical* structure of production on economic growth. Or consider the preposterous notion that specific skills are "practically of secondary importance" to theoretical analysis because skilled labor may be easily compared to unskilled labor by viewing both in a single line of work.

This comparison is easily made in Marxian economics because of the supposed existence of "abstract" labor through which specific kinds of labor are reduced to a "social aggregate." This notion is the key to an understanding of the labor theory of value, and Sweezy is quite right in emphasizing its importance. Once the abstract character of labor is established the labor theory of value becomes a workable concept. And, as Sweezy points out, the labor theory of value is the cardinal principle in Marxian economics. It governs the exchange of goods, the level of productive activity and the allocation of the labor force to the various branches of industry. But no proof is offered of the validity of the idea of "abstract" labor. And without such proof the labor theory of value itself may be seriously questioned.

Marxian value theory leads directly to surplus value—to the theory of exploitation. The concept of the surplus is one of those ideas that have long fascinated men because its simplicity promises a solution to all the pressing moral, social, political and economic problems of the day. Its all-embracing character, based as it is on the common experience of men, makes the notion attractively facile. Yet its very generality makes it quite dubious as a method of solving economic problems, for complications may be very easily ignored.

Some of these complications arise when Sweezy tries to show how incomes flow from one sector of the economy to another. Here he must translate value into price terms. Despite his claim that "value calculation makes it possible to look beneath the surface phenomena" he does not carry through this transition successfully. This leads one to suspect that Joan Robinson was quite right when she stated, in her recent "Essay on Marxian Economics," that "no point of substance in Marx's argument depends on the labor theory of value."

Where, then, is that "point of substance"? Mrs. Robinson thought that it could be found in Marx's version of the theory of effective demand. This idea is directly related to the theory of crises. Marx, unfortunately, never completed a unified theory of business cycles. It has to be extracted partly out of the discussion of expanded reproduction, and partly out of the treatment of capitalist accumulation. Sweezy has done a really brilliant job in consolidating the scattered statements of Marx on economic fluctuations. Crises in a capitalist economy, he suggests, are largely a result of lagging demand. Sweezy does not, however, ignore the factors of profit expectations, the saturation of investment opportunities, the collapse of pecuniary values and the presence of a reserve labor army. Analyzing these factors, he lists two types of crises, that which originates in changes in the rate of profit, and the kind whose source may be found in alterations in effective demand. His mathematical demonstration of declining demand and underconsumption is not only interesting, but enlightening. These chapters are by far the best part of the book.

Geopolitics!

Is it a science—or mystical nonsense?

Did it start with Haushofer? Does it offer anything, besides a threat, to America?

GEOPOLITICS cannot now be dismissed as fantastic. The theory behind German aggression—the underpinnings of the Nazi plan for world mastery—must be understood if we are to win. Furthermore, as Col. Beukema of the U. S. Military Academy says, "geopolitics can give us a long first step toward the realism needed if peace is to be something more than another Versailles." These three books are the first comprehensive attempt to describe for American readers the background, methods, and personalities of Geopolitics—to find its "core of truth" which can make it a blueprint for peace as well as for war.

GERMAN STRATEGY OF WORLD CONQUEST

By DERWENT WHITTLESEY This study shows conclusively that theories of geopolitics, "racism," the ambitions of Hitler, and the entire Nazi doctrine are parts of a gigantic, carefully designed scheme of world conquest worked out with ruthless precision, and that its roots find their sources deep in Germany's past.

293 + xiii pages, bibliography, maps, and index, $2.50

THE WORLD OF GENERAL HAUSHOFER

By ANDREAS DORPALEN "An extremely valuable contribution . . . the study of the relationship between space and power need no longer be left to a handful of army officers." —Col. Beukema. Covers the entire field of geopolitics in relation to world politics, economic policy, and population, with voluminous extracts from the writings of Haushofer, Mackinder, Ratzel, Kjellen, and others.

337 + xxi pages, index, $3.50

THE NAZI STATE

By WILLIAM EBENSTEIN What the Nazi ideologies have produced in their own country. An incredible—but true!—picture of a people who reject self-government, yet want to govern the rest of the world!

355 + xi pages, index, $2.75

FARRAR & RINEHART

232 Madison Avenue New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxists have always used their pet interpretations of the crisis theory to prove that capitalism will some day fall apart like the "one-hoss shay." Sweezy wisely refuses to yield to such facility. He sees capitalism going through an extended process of internal decay, moral degeneration and chronic depression. He does recognize certain forces which work to delay the tendency to social prostration. Such forces are the absorption of accumulated funds by investment errors, the growth of population and the development of new industries. But the tendencies to stagnation, based on the "inherent contradictions of underconsumption," must drive on inexorably to the ultimate doom of the capitalistic order. Reconstruction will depend on whether there will be a class capable of building a new civilization on the rubble of the old. This at least is Sweezy's picture. But the reader wonders whether all the difficulties of capitalism would be solved under socialism. Mightn't it be possible that an inability to eliminate the "contradiction" between consumption and production largely explains the history of the USSR between 1935 and 1939?

At one point Sweezy concedes that we may conceivably achieve under capitalism a balance among the various sectors of the economy. This demands, he notes, a revaluation of the aims and purposes of our economic system. But Sweezy has no faith in our ability to rebuild the structure of our moral values. Seeing the problem clearly, and unable to offer a solution, he prefers to alter the conditioning factors regardless of the cost. And that cost, we have learned, is terrifying in its destruction of human purpose, dignity and worth.

BEN B. SELIGMAN

SLAVES NEED NO LEADERS

An Answer to the Fascist Challenge to Education

By Walter M. Kotschnig

Dr. Kotschnig who served for eight years as general secretary of the International Student Service here presents a study of the impact of Fascist rule and occupation upon the various countries of Europe. He analyzes brilliantly the German mind and suggests what may be done after the war to change their war-keyed psychological pattern. He also forecasts the effect of the War on post-war education in America.

$2.75

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
114 Fifth Ave. • New York

The Story of the Red Army

The Red Army, by Michel Berchin and Eliahu Ben-Horin. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 277 pages. $3.

THE GREAT STORY of 1942 is the story of the remarkable resistance of the Red Army. After losing a territory twice the size of France, suffering four and a half million casualties and giving up the most important industrial base Russia had, the Red Army was able to come back in the fall, repulse the Germans at Stalingrad and launch a series of spectacular and successful offensives.

The all-important question is: how was the Red Army able to do it? This question is not satisfactorily answered in the book under review. The authors draw heavily on the works of Max Werner, Captain Sergei Kournakov and dispatches published in American, British and German newspapers. The richest source of information on Soviet affairs—the Soviet press—seems to have been little used. The book offers no exhaustive description of the organization, structure, equipment or combat training of the Red Army. The authors, however, do bring out several interesting and relatively new points.

The late Marshal Mikhail Tukhachevsky—author of the Red Army's defensive grand strategy—is quoted as having made the following remark when a prisoner in Germany during the First World War. When asked whether he believed in revolution in Russia, he answered: "We are a slack people, but deeply destructive. We have in us the child's love for fire. Should there be a revolution, only God knows in what it will end. . . . I think that a constitutional regime would mean the end of Russia. We need a despot. . . . We require the valiant power, Eastern cunning and the barbarian fire of Peter the Great."

The authors reveal a hitherto little known fact: Marshal Blukher was involved in the Right-Left opposition bloc led by Syrtsov in 1930 and had been designated War Minister in the new government which was to replace Stalin's regime. If true, this may explain the disappearance under obscure circumstances of Marshal Blukher in the late 1930's after a spectacular career as Soviet military adviser to China and as commander of the Far Eastern Red Armies.

Another new point of interest is the fact that one hundred Red Army commanders were sent to the Berlin Military Academy every year during the thirties, for special training, among them Marshals Budenny and Shaposhnikov.

The authors offer the following description of the development of nationalism in the Red Army during the thirties: . . . When the rulers of the Kremlin concluded that the World Revolution was not forthcoming, they began to fear aggression from the capitalist countries. They decided that the Soviet state had to entrench itself for the time being and accordingly shaped the Red Army to be the defender of the state and of the regime. Revolutionary phrases remained, but international spirit gave way step by step to the spirit of nationalism. . . . The present Red Army recruit undertakes [in his oath] to "defend his Fatherland." The oath does not differ in its spirit from the oath in any national army. . . . The patriotism [of the Red Army man] is not fully covered by the old formula "my country right or wrong." His country is always right.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In describing the Red Army purges in the late thirties, the authors say that "until recently no one except sworn Communists believed the . . . official version of the trials and executions. . . . Since the Nazi invasion of Russia, and since the Red Army turned out to be the only military force on the Continent able to resist the German war machine, the glorification of the USSR has become so common that some foreign circles have come to accept unconditionally the Stalinist explanations . . . that the old Bolsheviks and the best representatives of the Soviet High Command were all traitors and German spies. Joseph E. Davies, for example, apparently accepts this version."

The authors, both Russians and resident abroad for nearly a quarter-century, make their own position clear when they say: "We do not believe that the recognition of the military efficiency of the Soviet Union and the high qualities of the Red Army necessarily indicates that the purged generals were traitors and spies. The absence of a fifth column in Soviet Russia does not prove that Tukhachevsky . . . was a traitor, or that Generals Yakir and Feldman, both Jewish, were Hitler's agents, or that the old Bolshevik Gamarnik . . . was willing to deliver the Red Army to the fascists."

The authors go on to say that the most likely explanation of the army purge was the existence of a bona-fide conspiracy not against the state but against Stalin's regime—a fine distinction. Convinced of Stalin's incompetence, Tukhachavsky and the others decided to overthrow his regime and set up another headed by Tukhachevsky, whose program would provide for: continuation of the Soviet regime, but the institution of really democratic elections; return of the land to the peasants, with retention of the collective farms only when the peasants really desired them; the restitution of private property except railroads and public utilities; liquidation of the Comintern. If true this is interesting, but again does not contribute to an understanding of the resistance offered by the Red Army in 1941-42.

The book ends with a passionate plea for increased Allied aid to Soviet Russia as the only way to overcome the supremacy of Germany's war economy over that of the Soviet Union. "If the United Nations survive the present terrible crisis and ultimately bring overwhelming power to crush the Nazi-Fascist menace . . . they will have won by the time gained by the Red Army. . . ."

JOHN SCOTT

A Reader's List

REGIONAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT, by Alvin H. Hansen and Harvey S. Perloff (National Planning Association, 25 cents). Given the magnificent success of the TVA, the authors of this pamphlet remark, it is difficult to understand why we do not have similar programs for the other great river systems of the country. They propose that Congress establish agencies for such regional development now and that project blueprints be drawn up now, looking to a program in which we would invest about two billion dollars a year for a generation. The first step is educational: to convince all Americans that the planned development of every region is to the advantage of all. This booklet, in its level-headedness and simplicity of presentation, is admirably designed to persuade the general reader of the truth of this idea.

PEACE BY POWER, by Lionel Gelber (Oxford, $1.50). An articulate and honest statement in defense of the status quo raised to the level of a post-war system, by an intelligent conservative who is a Canadian professor of History. Mr. Gelber is weakest where his open adoration for the British Empire leads him to project a world of Anglo-American dominance, with China and Russia ignored (as they are in the book) and the same tired old excuses about India, strongest where he sees the realities of world peace as power and organization rather than pious ideals. His program includes a new League, a new balance of power, and something close to Vansittart's dismemberment of Germany. There should be many, lost in a world that seems irresistibly moving, for whom this assured voice out of the nostalgic past will have a fine sound.

Alaska—from Gold to Guns!

ALASKA is now linked to Canada and the United States by the great Alcan highway! And "Seward's Folly" is thus transformed from a $7,200,000 blunder to a vital asset to the United States and the United Nations, with its great natural wealth and strategic position on the globe. To know Alaska as it is *today* read this 64-page booklet, just issued by the Institute of Pacific Relations. It is crammed full of facts about Alaska's history, geography, strategic military factors, harbors, cities, climates, and its peculiar political problems. It will be sent to you

FREE

with your trial subscription to the

FAR EASTERN SURVEY

(A FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW)

MID-JANUARY issue includes exclusive report on the recent international conference at Mont Tremblant, Quebec, on post-war problems in the Far East vitally affecting America and *your future*, by FREDERICK V. FIELD—Colonel Carlson's Guerrilla Raiders in the Solomons—Return to Chungking of the Chinese Military Mission—Book reviews by PEARL BUCK and others.

SPECIAL OFFER

10 ISSUES (20 WEEKS) FOR

$1

(Regular price without booklet, $2.50; with booklet, $2.65.)

AMERICAN COUNCIL,
INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS
Dept. R, 129 East 52nd Street, N. Y. C.

For the enclosed $1 enter my subscription for the next 10 issues of the FAR EASTERN SURVEY, beginning with the January issue, giving the full report on the recent War-time I. P. R. Conference. Also include, FREE, the booklet "ALASKA COMES OF AGE" by J. C. Edelstein.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY & STATE.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNITED NATIONS DISCUSSION GUIDE, by the Research Department of the Foreign Policy Association (United States Office of Education). An excellent little pamphlet devoted to the large and important idea that "the United Nations are learning, by bitter experience, that united action offers the only chance of winning the war—and the peace to follow." Its five parts are entitled: "Who Are the United Nations?"; "Why Did These Nations Unite?"; "What Are These Nations Fighting For?"; "What Are These Nations Doing to Win?"; "Can These Nations Stay United in Peace?" Along with its cogent thesis it presents much well arranged factual and statistical material. Teachers, leaders of discussion groups and speakers can obtain copies free of charge from the United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

PLANNING FOR SOCIAL SECURITY (Planning No. 190, 50 cents). No little of the dynamite that is in this dry 52-page broadsheet of the British Political and Economic Planning group was taken by the Beveridge Commission and put into its headline report on post-war social security, now laid before Parliament. Here is the original program, including the proposal for a national minimum income and the suggestion that provision for security be taken out of the hands of "a type of commercial enterprise, the main interest of which is not social service but the difference between what is paid to it and what it has to pay out," *i. e.*, the private insurance companies. It is an epochal document. Copies may be obtained from The New Republic.

AFTER THE WAR, by Maxwell S. Stewart (Public Affairs Pamphlets, 10 cents). A splendid brief summary, for the average reader, of the various aspects and opportunities of post-war reconstruction, presented in a readable and intelligent way. As Mr. Stewart says, the hardest part of the job ahead is "getting people to think straight, and to think in today's terms." A wide distribution for this brochure would be an admirable contribution to that objective.

OUTLOOK FOR FRANCE, a broadsheet issued by PEP of London (Planning, No. 193). A consideration of the future of France declaring, on the basis of interdependence in social, economic and political ideals, that the post-war reconstruction of that country would be facilitated by a policy of coöperation with Britain. Several alternatives such as alignment with Soviet Russia and the United States are mentioned but quickly dismissed. Conspicuously absent in this forecast of France's future role is discussion of the part she might play in a United Nations of Europe, or her possible leadership of a post-war social revolution.

BOMBS AWAY, by John Steinbeck (Viking, $2.50). A patriotic hack job, written as an elaborate recruiting brochure for the Army Air Forces, illustrated with sixty good photographs by John Swope. In this book, Steinbeck is frequently eloquent and always clear in describing technical stuff, but his passion for writing down to his presumed readers (prospective fliers and their parents) has simplified his style to the point where it reads like a parody of Hemingway; reduces his characters, the hypothetical fliers, to the baldest stock types; and debased his ideas to a rather dangerous level, as when he says of the bomber team: "They had no patriotic sentiments. Those were for politicians." The book will probably raise a great deal of money for the Air Forces Trust Fund, but it bears about the same relationship to literature that a recruiting poster does to art.

THOMAS MANN'S WORLD, by Joseph Gerard Brennan (Columbia, $2.50). Dr. Brennan's study deals with some of the key problems and recurrent themes of Thomas Mann's major works, such as the relation between the artist and bourgeois society, the link between art and disease, and the connections between individual psychology and the psychology of myth. In these sections of his book where he covers relatively fresh ground, namely in his chapter on the influence of music on Mann's style and in his treatment of Mann's political writings, Dr. Brennan makes a fairly important contribution. But the book as a whole is a rather conventional study, repeating what has often been said before by other students, and limited by an unimaginative method that substitutes citation and cross-reference for more fruitful analysis of the dialectical structure of Mann's ideas. Of value for librarians if not for poets.

Contributors

WALTON HAMILTON is a professor at the Yale Law School and the author, among other books, of "Patents and Free Enterprise," published last year.

CAREY MCWILLIAMS was, until January 5, 1943, Chief of California's Division of Immigration and Housing. Republican Gov. Earl Warren's first official act was to remove him from this position. His new book, "Brothers under the Skin," which deals with colored minorities in the United States, will be published next month by Little, Brown.

ELEANOR D. WELLS was "brought up in more places than she can remember." She spent four years of her childhood in Jamaica, British West Indies, returned there in 1941 and became interested in the American Canteen. She has recently returned to New York.

BEN B. SELIGMAN, economist and teacher, is now with the Office of Price Administration.

JOHN SCOTT was for two years Russian correspondent for The London News-Chronicle. His latest book, "Duel for Europe," was published last fall by Houghton Mifflin Company.

IS SOCIALISM STILL VALID?
Friday, January 22, 8 P. M.
How does socialist theory stand up in the light of recent developments?
Saturday, January 23, 2 P. M.
Is collectivism compatible with democracy?
BERTRAND RUSSELL
MAX EASTMAN
SIDNEY HOOK
JOHN CHAMBERLAIN
ALGERNON LEE
GEORGE S. COUNTS
Raphael ABRAMOWITCH
RAND SCHOOL 7 EAST 15th STREET ALgonquin 4-3094 • $1.00 For Both Sessions

POSTAGE FREE
Books of all publishers promptly mailed anywhere in the U. S. A.
NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS
40 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y.

SPANISH by LINGUAPHONE
The quick, easy, correct way to speak any of 29 languages. World famous Linguaphone Ear-Eye method brings voices of native teachers into your own home. *Send for FREE Book*
LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
86 R.C.A. Building New York City

LITERARY SERVICE
TREATISES, RESEARCH PAPERS, SPEECHES. Special Articles, reviews, promptly prepared to requirements of busy professionals. Our extensive experience available at moderate rates, with assurance of scholarly serviceable result. AUTHORS RESEARCH BUREAU, 516 Fifth Avenue, New York.

TRANSLATING—TUTORING
SPANISH. Writer recently returned from South America desires translating Spanish-English or tutoring in Spanish. Tel. CHelsea 3-1682.

WANTED TO BUY
LINGUAPHONE. Any language. Indicate condition, language, number of records and books. LANGUAGE, Room 804, 18 East 41st St., N. Y. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED